420.4
Har/F
65096

00065096

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-1.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

FRAGMENTS

OF

TWO ESSAYS

IN ENGLISH PHILOLOGY

65096

BY THE LATE

JULIUS CHARLES HARE M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES

SOMETIME FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1873

I. Words derived from Names of Persons.

II. Words corrupted by False Analogy or False Derivation.

00065096

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following sheets, pp. 1—56, 1—80, have been for many years lying at the Pitt Press unfinished and unpublished. They were, as I conjectured and am assured by Bishop Thirlwall, the work of archdeacon Hare, whose representatives have authorised the publication. Only 180 copies are for sale.

A few references may be of service to those who have made acquaintance with 'Guesses at Truth,' 'The Mission of the Comforter,' 'The Victory of Faith.' In a note to Prof. Ramsay's preface to Cic. p. Cluent. the translation of Niebuhr's 'Letter to a young man who wished to devote himself to philology' is ascribed to 'that most accomplished scholar and most amiable man, the late archdeacon Hare.' An account of his domestic life in Bernhard Gäbler's Die vollständige Liturgie und die 39 Artikel der Kirche von England, Altenburg, 1843, 8vo. pp. 16, 21: cf. Schaff's papers on the parties in the English church in Schneider's Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben, Berlin, 1857. Bishop Thirlwall's Greece and Bunsen's Hippolytus are dedicated to him. His brother-in-law, Prof. Maurice, prefixed a sketch of his life to his postumous charges; Prof. Plumptre has added to the later editions of 'Guesses at Truth' memoirs of the two principal

authors. I printed some gleanings in the Journal of classical and sacred philology, II 330. Add Quarterly Review 1858, p. 520. There is a notice in the Biographical Magazine, VII (1855), p. 329. Two funeral sermons upon C. J. Hare by H. V. Elliott and J. N. Simpkinson were published in 1855. On his brother Francis see Landor's iambi n. 42 and inscriptiones new ed. p. 262. Various memoirs of his friends contain letters or other materials for his life: e. g. Simpkinson's Life of George Wagner, Cambridge, Macmillan, 1858, 8vo. Marshman's Life of Havelock, ed. 1, pp. 4, 6, 7, 199, 202, 203, 205, 224, 225, 296; letters ib. 200, 201. Stanley's Life of Arnold. Bunsen's Life. Forster's Life of Landor. H. Crabb Robinson's Diary. Bateman's Life of H. V. Elliott. Robert Southey's letters. Above all, 'Memorials of a quiet life,' that of Maria widow of Augustus Hare, by A. J. C. Hare, Lond. 1872. Gent. Mag. 1834, I 664 (account of A. W. H.); ib. 1855 I 424—5 (memoir of Julius Ch. H.); ib. 1864 I 406 (death of the widow of Julius Ch. H., Jane Esther, 20 Febr. 1864, in Kensington Palace Gardens). See also Walford's Annual Biography 1856, p. 201. Dr Whewell's voluminous correspondence, of which a selection will shortly be published with a memoir by Mr Todhunter, includes many letters from archdeacon Hare. The promised Life of Prof. Maurice will also no doubt throw much light upon the thoughts and labours of his like-minded friend and workfellow.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
17 *Dec.* 1872.

WORDS DERIVED FROM NAMES OF PERSONS.

THE most natural and appropriate occasion on which the names of persons are transferred to things, is when an invention is called after its inventor. Thus

Sir W. Congreve has given his name to the *Congreve rockets;*

Shrapnell to the *Shrapnell shells;*

Bramah to the *Bramah locks*, and *Bramah pens;* and so on. In such phrases the latter word after a time is usually dropt: before long we shall probably say merely a *congreve*, a *shrapnell*, a *bramah;* and then in after ages it will be discoverd, that the first was invented by the famous comic poet, and that the last is somehow or other connected with the Indian god: a conjecture which will be supported by shewing how frequently the aspirate slips from one syllable into another, so that *Brahma* might easily become *Bramah.*

The lamp invented by Argand is already called simply an *argand:*

The life-annuity on survivorship devised by Tonti, a *tontine.*

We eat *sandwiches*, and drink *negus*, without remembering that the Lord Sandwich, who was first lord of the admiralty in Lord Norths administration, and whose name was on that account given by Cooke to the Sandwich ilands, was also the first person who put a thin slice of meat between two thin slices of bread; or that Col. Negus in Queen Annes time first mixt wine and water into so pleasant a beverage.

The index scale of a graduated instrument is called a *vernier*, after Pierre Vernier, a native of Burgundy, who first published this invention in 1631. Until La-

lande asserted the claims of its true author, it used to be called a *nonius*, after Nonius, or Nunnez, a Portuguese mathematician, the inventor of a less perfect instrument for a similar purpose; from which his name, having been given to it, was transferred to Verniers improvement.

The name of Dr. Guillotin was very soon affixt to the instrument for decapitation which he introduced into France, and which even by Burke, within two or three years of its first being set in action there, was simply termed a *guillotine:* its activity too was such that it became necessary ere long to coin the verb, to *guillotine.* Not that Dr. Guillotin was the inventor: he merely recommended the adoption of an instrument which had long existed in Italy under the name of a *mannaia*, and of which there is a representation in the *Symbolicæ Quæstiones* of Achilles Bocchius, Pl. XVIII, publisht in 1555. A machine of the same kind, called a *maiden*, is said to have been long in use at Halifax in Yorkshire, and to have been imported from thence into Scotland by the regent Morton. Douce remarks (Illustr. of Shaksp. I. 304) that in the cuts to the first edition of Holinshed, a similar machine is twice represented, V. II. p. 654, Hist. of Irel. 49: and he conceives that this mode of punishment is alluded to in As you Like it, III. 5, "The common executioner *Falls not the axe* upon the humbled neck;" and perhaps in Henry VI, S. P. II. 4, "But stirre at nothing, till the axe of death *Hang over thee.*" Even the improvements made in the construction were not devised by Dr. Guillotin, but by M. Louis, a surgeon, from whom at first it was called *la petite Louison.* Still less foundation is there for the prevalent story that Dr. Guillotin was beheaded by his own instrument: one may perhaps wonder that the French-jacobins refraind from so tempting a practical joke: but though he was sent to prison, he was releast by the revolution of the ninth of Thermidor, and lived till 1814, when he died peaceably of old age in his bed.

Macadams roads speed travelling so much, that not only is *macadamize* a common English word, but we

may hear *macadamizer* in France, and *macadamiziren* in Germany.

In like manner Galvani has given his name to *galvanism;*

Volta to the *voltaic battery;*

Palladio to the *Palladian* style of architecture;

Alcæus to the *Alcaic* metre;

Sappho to the *Sapphic;*

Anacreon to the *Anacreontic;*

Phalæcus to the *Phalæcian;* and so on.

The *alexandrine* verse is so called after a French poem on the life of Alexander, founded on the romances of Quintus Curtius and Simeon Seth. This poem, supposed by Roquefort to have been published in 1184, was one of the first of any length written in lines of twelve syllables: and not only was the poem itself called the *Roman d'Alexandre*, but Alexander of Paris was one, and apparently the chief of its four authors.

The name *leonine*, as applied to riming Latin verse, is said to be derived from Leonius or Leoninus, a French monk in the time of Louis VII, the author of several poems in that metre; which however had been in use centuries before. The French in old times had also a verb, *leonimer, to versify with elegance.*

Thus again the calendar as regulated by Julius Cesar, with the help of Sosigenes, the Peripatetic, and of the astronomical knowledge he had himself acquired during his stay at Alexandria, was called the *Julian;*

As reformd in 1582 by Pope Gregory XIII, in consequence of a decree by the council of Trent, the *Gregorian.* The scheme of this reformation having been mainly suggested by a Calabrian astronomer, *Luigi Lilio*, the new calendar has at times been termd the *Lilian.*

Coins frequently bear the name of the king whose head is stampt upon them. We read of *darics* and *philips* in ancient times; and when we go abroad we fill our pockets with *louis* and *napoleons:* the termination

d'or, which used to be appended to those names, has fallen almost wholly into disuse. So our gold coin which preceded the guinea, was called a *jacobus*, and that too long after the death of James the first: for though the term, a *carolus*, was occasionally used, it seems never to have become current.

In like manner the shillings coind by Edward VI were called *Edwards*, and being of a considerable size were used in playing at shovel board. These are the *Edward shovel boards* that cost Master Slender two shillings and twopence apiece: M. W. W. I. 1. The *Harry ten shillings* spoken of in the second part of Henry the Fourth, III. 2, were the ten-shilling pieces coind by Henry the seventh or eighth. *Harry-groats* too, the groats coind by Henry VIII, are mentiond in Westward Ho, II. 1, by Mayne in the City Match II. 3, and by Marmion in the Antiquary III. 1: from which passages they appear, after having passed out of circulation, to have been hoarded as rarities, just as *Annes farthings* were in later times. Again in Westward Ho, II. 2, we find mention of *Elizabeth twelvepences*, and in Northward Ho, II. 1, of *Philip-rials*.

In earlier ages coins bore religious emblems: our goldpiece had a representation of an *angel*, and was so called: the French too had their *angelot:* the Milanese their *ambrosin*, after Ambrose, their great archbishop and patron saint.

Among plants, flowers, minerals, shells, numbers are named after the person who first discoverd them, or after some one to whom he was desirous of paying a compliment.

In the Linnean nomenclature a great part, perhaps the majority of the generic names, are derived from eminent botanists or physicians:

Theophrasta from Theophrastus;

Hippocratea from Hippocrates;

Plinia from Pliny;

Musa from Antonius Musa, the physician of Augustus;

Gesneria, from Conrad Gesner;

Dioscorea, from Dioscorides; the analogies of language being occasionally violated, for the sake of avoiding words of too great a length;

Matthiola, from Matthiolus, his editor; and so on.

From the specific names Linneus excludes all such as are derived from persons, and requires that they should be characteristic of the plant. Though there is a good deal in this system that is arbitrary, yet it has set up a fixt principle for its own regulation; it coincides in some measure with a tendency which in modern times has been pretty general; and without this aid it may be doubted whether even the plastic powers of the Greek language—that language which still, after having so long been dead, has more life in it than any other—would be sufficient to answer the perpetual demands of scientific naturalists. In the names however devised by our gardeners no attention is paid to the restrictions laid down by Linneus. Every new sort must have a new name; and most of these are derived from persons of eminence, but no way connected with botany. Thus one sort of geranium is called *Royal George*; another *Wellington*; a third *Prince Leopold*; and so on.

Nor is even the scientific nomenclature in other branches of natural philosophy subjected to the same well defined rules: for they have had no great legislator like Linneus. In every branch however there is a multitude of names derived from persons. Among the minerals called after the persons who discoverd, or imported, or examined them, are *Wavellite* from Dr. Wavel, *Prehnite* from Col. Prehn, *Dolomite* from M. Dolomieu. Names of this kind have recently increast beyond all limit: every new mineral has been graced with the name of some friend either of mineralogy, or of the discoverer. Thus we have *Hauyne*, *Humboldtite*, *Vauquelinite*, *Jamesonite*, *Brookite*, *Napoleonite*, and the like. The termination *ite* in these words is borrowd

from *lite*, the French representative of λίθος, in *chrysolite, oolite, coccolite.*

The same method has been resorted to in conchology; especially to provide names for the immense number of new sorts of shells which have become known of late years from the fossile vestiges of them discoverd in the earth. Thus one shell is called *clavigella Brocchii*, another *tellina Henslowana*, a third *ammonites Sedgwickii*,—a word no Roman would have known what to make of.

The business of this paper however is not with the manufacture of words by the batch among the learned, but with their growing up one by one among the people. And among them we may find traces of the same practice which has been carried to such an extent by men of science.

Glaubers salts derive their name from a well-known Dutch chemist of the 17th century, by whom they were prepared.

The masses of clay, separated internally into pieces bearing a rude resemblance to dice, are called *ludus Helmontii*, from Van Helmont, who used to administer this substance medicinally against the stone.

So among plants *herb-Gerard* is named after Gerard, the author of the Herball.

The Linnean name for tobacco, *Nicotiana*, was at one time a popular name. One sort of it is called *Nicotian* by Bobadil in *Every Man in his Humour* III. 2: "For your green wound, your Balsamum and your St. Johns wort are all mere gulleries and trash to tobacco, especially your Trinidado: your *Nicotian* is good too." This name was brought from France, where the herb was commonly called *Nicotiane*, having been first sent thither by Jean Nicot, as he himself states in his *Thresor de la Langue Françoyse.* "*Nicotiane* est une espece d'herbe de vertu admirable pour guarir toutes naurures, playes, ulceres, chancres, dartres, et autres tels accidens au corps humain, que Jean Nicot, estant Ambassadeur de sa Majesté Très-chrestienne en Portugal, envoya en France

l'an 1560. Dont toutes provinces de ce royaume ont esté engées et peuplées, à cause de quoy la ditte herbe a obtenu et porté le nom de Nicotiane." It was sent to the Grand Prieur of the Queen, Catherine of Medicis: whence it was also called *herbe au Grand Prieur*, *herbe à la Reine;* and the latter name spred into Italy under the form of *herba regina*. This is alluded to by Buchanan in the epigram where playing on both her names he says:

> At Medice Catharina, κάθαρμα luesque suorum,
> Medea sæculi sui,
> Ambitione ardens Medicææ nomine plantam
> Nicotianam adulterat;
> Utque bonis cives prius exuit, exuere herbæ
> Honore vult Nicotium.
> At nectar virus fiet, panacea venenum,
> Medicæa si vocabitur.

Nevertheless Daniel, a man of a liberal education and considerable learning, deduces the name *Nicotian*, in a mask acted before the Queen at Oxford in 1605, from an iland of *Nicosia*, which never had any existence on the face of the earth. Alcon, a quacksalver, in the Queens Arcadia, III. 1, says he has lately met with a seaman who has brought

> ———a certaine hearbe wrapt up in rowles
> From the island of Nicosia, where it growes;
> Infused, I thinke, in some pestiferous juice,
> Or else steeped in the fuming sap itselfe
> Doth yeeld, to inforce the infecting power thereof:
> And this in powder made, and fired, he suckes
> Out of a little hollow instrument
> Of calcinated clay the smoake thereof:
> Which either he convayes out of his nose,
> Or downe into his stomacke with a whiffe.
> And this, he said, a wondrous vertue had
> To purge the head, and cure the great catarre,
> And to dry up all other meaner rhumes.
> Which when I saw, I straightway thought how well
> This new fantasticall devise would please
> The foolish people here growne humorous.

And now if you could see with what a strange
And gluttonous desire they exhaust the same,
How infinite and how insatiably
They doe devoure the intoxicating fume,
You would admire, as if their spirits thereby
Were taken, and inchanted or transformed
By some infused philter in the drug.
For whereas heretofore they wonted were,
At all their meetings and their festivalls,
To passe the time in telling witty tales,
In questions, riddles, and in purposes,
Now doe they nothing else but sit and sucke,
And spit and slaver all the time they sit.
But sure the times to come, when they look backe
On this, will wonder with themselves to thinke
That men of sense could ever be so mad
To sucke so grosse a vapour, that consumes
Their spirits, fends nature, dries up memorie,
Corrupts the blood, and is a vanitie.

These lines seem to imply that smoking was then coming into fashion at the universities: but the purpose of introducing this invective was probably that the mask was to be acted before King James, who abhorred tobacco so much that he blew a *Counterblaste* to it; and who in this same year, perhaps on the very same day, acted as moderator in the schools at Oxford, while the question was canvast, *Utrum frequens suffitus Nicotianæ exoticæ sit sanis salutaris;* a point strongly controverted in the Counterblaste.

This passage from Daniel shews how cautious one ought to be in receiving statements on points of etymology, even when they seem to come from good authority: for Daniel was writing within half a century of the introduction of the name. If it be urged that he was merely indulging in a play of fancy, though nothing is gaind by his fabricating the iland Nicosia, and Alcon might just as well have said he had receivd the herb from a sage named Nicotius, at all events we have an instance of the manner in which false derivations are propagated: for had we no better authority, Daniels fiction would certainly be regarded as such. Probably

however he was mistaken; and as he believed the names of *tobacco* and *trinidado* to come from *Tobago* and *Trinidad*, he supposed that *Nicotian* too must come from *Nicosia*.

When first brought into Italy this herb was called *Tornabuona*, from Tornabuoni, who introduced it. But this and all its other names have been superseded by one supposed to be derived from Tobago, the iland from which the Spaniards first imported it.

Pauls betony, one of the names given to the *veronica* or speedwell, owes its origin to the notion that this is the plant described by Paulus Ægineta (VII. 3) under the name of βεττονική, as a πόα λεπτόκλωνος, παραπλήσια τὰ κλῶνα τοῖς τοῦ γλήχωνος ἔχουσα. This plant, he expressly states, has nothing in common with the Roman βεττονική, save its medical efficacy. The latter is called *vettonica* by Pliny, XXV. 46, after the *Vettones*, a people of Spain: and it has been supposed to be the same with our *betony*, which derives its name from it; though Salmasius (de Homonymis Hyles Iatricæ XLIII) gives strong reasons for questioning the correctness of this opinion. The virtues of the *vettonica* were such, that, Pliny says, "domus in qua sata sit, tuta existimetur a piaculis omnibus;" and from a tract on those virtues ascribed to Musa, it seems that there was scarcely a malady it would not cure: whence the Italian saying of anything excellent, that it has "piu virtù che la *bettonica*." Thus two plants were confounded under the same name: or rather two names of different origin —for the βεττονική of Paulus is evidently a Greek word —were confounded from similarity of sound. But when *St Veronica* became an object of worship, it was not unnatural for *vetonica* and *veronica* to be associated: and thus in process of time the two plants were again distinguished; and that which is supposed to be *Pauls betony* obtaind the name of *veronica*, the propriety of the other name being regarded as settled by Plinys description. In Germany the *veronica* is called *Ehrenpreis*: which looks like a word formed to represent

something like the sound of the original, with a meaning however of its own. The *betony* on the other hand is *betonie*, but among the lower orders *batenige*, *patenige*, and, for the sake of making its name express its *angelical* qualities, *bathengel*.

A few similar names are to be found in the ancient languages, some of which are still preserved amongst us.

The *gentian* is related both by Dioscorides, III. 3, and Pliny, XXV. 34, to be so called after Gentius, a king of Illyria, by whom it was discoverd. Probably, as Pliny says the best grew in Illyria, the Romans gave it the name of the Illyrian prince who governed the country at the time of their conquest, and with whose name they were familiar from his having been led in triumph before the car of Anicius, and past the latter part of his life at Spoleto (Livy XLV. 43). For though γεντιανὴ occurs in Dioscorides, its form shews it to be of Roman origin; nor is there any such word in Theophrastus.

The *Alexandrian laurel* according to Stephanus of Byzantium was so termed, because Alexander was crownd with it in the games. Dioscorides too (IV. 147) mentions στεφανὴ among its names; and Pliny (XV. 39) speaks of a kind called *stephanon Alexandri*. That the name does not come from *Alexandria* is clear; because in that case it would have been Ἀλεξανδρινὴ or Ἀλεξανδρῖτις, whereas Theophrastus (I. 10. 8. III. 17. 4) writes it Ἀλεξανδρεία. In the latter passage moreover he speaks of it as peculiar to mount Ida: which has led Salmasius (in Solin. p. 287) to conjecture that the Alexander referd to must have been the Homeric Ἀλέξανδρος, Paris. But if there was any ground for the tradition, it far more probably alluded to the games celebrated by Alexander around the tomb of Achilles; when, as Plutarch tells us, c. 15, he himself engaged in a race with his companions, and placed a crown on the monument of the hero who was so fortunate as during his life to have a faithful friend, and after his death a noble herald. Pliny adds in the passage last referd to: it is an ancient remark,

that no kind of laurel is native in Corsica. Natures prophesy however has not been verified: unless she shelters herself under the evasion, that as the laurel flourisht there when imported, so the Buonapartes were also aliens who took refuge in the iland.

Alexander is also an English name for a kind of parsley: this must probably be the same plant which Dioscorides (III. 77) speaks of as a native of Macedonia; and which was therefore called *petroselinum Macedonium* or *Alexandrinum*. For otherwise one can hardly suppose that the Latin name *olus atrum* could have been corrupted into *Alexander* or *Alisander*. And yet when we are told that the *pyrethrum* is called by the French *pied d'Alexandre*, the want of any other solution disposes us to imagine that this, however strange, must be a corruption of *pyrethrum salinare*, its Latin name. The same word *pyrethrum* has been strangely disfigured, in Spain into *pelitre*, with us into *pellitory*—which is likewise our substitute for *parietaria*, the Latin name for the wall-flower—and by the Germans into *Bertram*.

Candy Alexanders, a kind of smyrnium, formerly supposed to be a kind of parsley, seems to owe its name to the same notion of its being a Macedonian plant.

The name of *Mithridates*, which Pliny tells us was given by Cratevas to a plant of very powerful efficacy, has been applied amongst us to a sort of mustard, and also to one of the wolfsbanes: of course with reference to the story of his having acquired the power of counteracting poisons. The same story led the chemists of old to give the same name to a powerful antidote compounded of a variety of drugs, and said by them to have been first invented by the king of Pontus. Valencia was famous for its fabrication, as appears from Southeys notes to the Cid p. 421. This is the *mithridates* spoken of in Beaumont and Fletcher by Valentinian, v. 2, and in the Sea Voyage v. 2. Hence music in Lylys Midas, IV. 4, is termed a "*mithridate* for melancholy." The blundering ranter who wrote Tamburlaine, seems to have quite mistaken its nature: for he speaks of it along with "Thessalian drugs," as something baneful, v. 2.

The name of the *lysimachia* is deduced from *Lysimachus* by Hesychius and Pliny, xxv. 35: they say nothing about him however except that he discoverd it. So that since Dioscorides, iv. 3, mentions λύτρον as another name for it, and says it was very effective in stanching blood, we may believe that the Greek name has been rightly renderd by the common English one, *loose-strife*; without having recourse to Plinys story, that it will quiet unruly oxen, if placed upon their yoke.

Nor is Pliny better justified in deducing *artemisia* from the wife of Mausolus, xxv. 36. That name existed long before her time, and is frequently used by Hippocrates. No doubt the plant was so called from being consecrated to Artemis on account of its medical virtues.

Of the *euphorbia* Pliny tells us (v. 1. xxv. 38) that it was first discoverd on mount Atlas by Juba; who named it after his physician *Euphorbus*, the brother of Antonius Musa, and wrote a special book on its virtues. The substance of this account is confirmed by Dioscorides, iii. 96, by Solinus, c. 24, and by Galen κατὰ τόπους ix. 4: so that it may fairly be believed; without heeding the enigma by Philo, quoted by Galen, which derives *euphorbia* from the Homeric Euphorbus, the killer of Patroclus.

Nor can one doubt about *Lucullean* marble being so called, as Pliny tells us, xxxvi. 8, because it was first brought into Italy from Egypt by Lucullus. Modern mineralogers from their undistinguishing love for the termination *ite* call this black marble *Lucullite*.

But though Pliny (xxxvi. 67) says that *obsidian* derives its name from its likeness to the stone which Obsidius found in Ethiopia, this story, which has a very questionable look in consequence of our utter ignorance about any such Obsidius having traveld in parts so remote, is overthrown, as Salmasius remarks (in Sol. 64), by our finding that the same Ethiopic stone is called οψιανὸς in Arrian, and the Orphic Λιθ. 282; probably from its transparency. This favours the form *Obsianus*, which is found in the old editions of Pliny.

Another source from which many popular names of flowers were derived, was the hagiology of the catholic church. A favorite flower in the middle ages was usually consecrated to, and often called after, a favorite saint; especially when it had any medical virtues: the choice of the saint being usually directed by the season when the flower blossomd. Most of these names were probably assignd by monks, who were our first gardeners, and were skilled in the properties of simples: and this will account for their general diffusion: for some of these names spred over great part of christian Europe, while others were restricted to particular nations, or even districts.

Erba S. Giovanni is a name given in Italy to several plants that are in flower at the festival of St John the Baptist; and early figs are *fichi S. Giovanni*. With us and in Germany *hypericum* is by way of eminence *St Johns wort* and *Johannis kraut*. The high notion entertaind of its medical efficacy is shewn by the extract given above (p. 6) from Every Man in his Humour. "On the vigil of St John the Baptist (says Stowe) every mans door is shadowed with green birch, long fennel, *St Johns wort*, orpin, white lilies, and such like." The same plant was used by maidens in divination, and was regarded in Germany as a potent charm against evil spirits; whence it was also called *Jägeteufel*, *Teufelsflucht*.

The *ascyrum*, or *hard hay*, a plant something like the former, and blowing at the same time, but with larger leaves, is called *Square St Johns Grass* or *St Peters wort*, the festivals of the two saints being within five days of each other. In Germany it goes by the names of *St Peterswurz* or *hartheu*, in Italy of *erba di S. Pietro* or *finocchio marino*; the latter name being a corruption of the Latin *fœniculum marinum*.

Wall-barley or *St Peters corn*, in German *Peterscorn*, is said to ripen about the same time: but in this instance as in some others the name of the apostle may have been substituted for the word it was derived from,

and *Peterscorn* properly may have been only a *synonym* for *wall-barley*, to denote *corn growing among stones.*

St James wort, herba S. Jacobi, Jacobœa, erba S. Jacopo, Jacobs blume, flowers about the feast of St James, the 25th of July.

The same day was also the festival of St Christopher, and it was at this season that the fruit of *herb Christopher* ripend. When that name is given to the *waterfern*, it seems to be with reference to the legend of St Christopher, who is usually represented as wading through a river, bearing the infant Christ on his shoulders: a legend which itself seems to have arisen out of the name χριστόφορος, or *Christ-bearer*, assumed by the saint in a spiritual sense, as Ignatius called himself θεόφορος, to express his carrying the deity in his heart.

Winter-cresses are termed *herb St Barbara, Barbarkraut*, or *Barbenkraut*, St Barbaras day being the 4th of December.

For a like reason the black hellebore, which flowers about Christmas, is called *Christwurz* in Germany, with us the *Christmas rose*, and also the flower of St Agnes, whose festival was on the 21st of January.

The *carduus solstitialis*, or thistle that is in its prime at the summer solstice, is *St Barnabies thistle.*

Herb Robert, Robertskraut or *Ruprechtskraut*, a sort of wild geranium, flowers in April, the 29th of which was consecrated to St Robert. Adelung deduces the German name from a certain disease, which used to be called *Sanct Ruprechtsplage*, and against which this plant was held to be a powerful remedy. But how then did the disease get this name? Far more probably was it so called, because St Robert cured it by means of his herb.

Sweet William was dedicated to St William, whose festival was on the 25th of June: so that the adjective *sweet* is probably a substitution for *saint.*

A like substitution seems to have taken place in *sweet John*, which blows about the sixth of May, the festival of St John Port Latin, and of St John of Damascus.

Bishops weed also bore the name of *herb William*, and flowers toward the end of June.

There are so many St Catherines, that it is difficult to determine in honour of which among them the *nigella* was called *St Catherines flower*; whether St Catherine of Sienna whose festival was the 30th of April, or St Catherine of Genoa to whom the 14th of September was consecrated. The seed of the nigella is sown about the former season: it blows about the latter. Or did the fancy detect some dim likeness between the shape of the flower and that of *St Catherines wheel?* In that case it would be after St Catherine the martyr, who was commemorated on the 25th of November, and who certainly was much more generally known than her namesakes: not only was her emblem used as the sign of an inn; but from Northward Ho, III. 1, it appears that *Catherine-wheel farthingales* were then the fashion. The application of the name in fireworks is probably of later origin, and was suggested by the story of her martyrdom. "She is said (according to Alban Butler) to have been put on an engine made of four wheels joined together, and stuck with sharp spikes, that, when the wheels moved, were to tear her body in pieces. At the first stirring of this engine, the acts add, the cords that bound her burst asunder, and the engine fell miraculously to pieces."

It was probably in honour of the same St Catherine, that the *Catherine-pear* was so called: just as the *Martin-pear* is that which ripens about Martinmas. The beautiful colour of the former seems at one time to have been proverbial amongst us. Suckling, when describing the bride in his Ballad upon a Wedding, says:

> Her cheeks so faire a white was on,
> No daisy makes comparison;
> Who sees them is undone:
> For streaks of red were mingled there,
> Such as are on a *Catherine pear*
> The side that's next the sun.

Gay again in his Pastorals, which are full of vivid rustic reality, and in which he gives vent to his love for rural

imagery on his escape from his apprenticeship at the silk-mercers, makes Sparabella boast, when comparing herself with her rival,

> Her wan complexion's like the witherd leek,
> While *Catherine pears* adorn my ruddy cheek.

In Westward Ho we meet with the odd epithet *Catherine-pear-coloured* beards: and in Rowleys Woman never Vext, III. 1, the *Catherine pear* is opposed to the popperin in a manner which shews how highly the former was esteemd. There were also *St Catherines* peaches and plums.

The foregoing examples are enough to justify the conjecture that the *filbert* tree may perhaps owe its name to *St Philibert*, whose festival was on the 22nd of August. This name stands quite alone; at least no cognate word has been discoverd either in our own or any other language: Skinners supposition that it comes from *full beard* has nothing to support it, except the German name *Bartnuss:* and though Todd seems to have been satisfied with Gowers fable that *Phillis* was transformed into a hazel, and that

> ——After Phillis *Philiberd*
> This tree was cleped in the yerd,
> And yet for Demophon to shame
> Unto this day it bearth the name,

most will think that the old poet was consciously indulging in a play of fancy; and few will suppose that there is any better ground for his derivation, than for the one stated by Hyginus, c. 59, and by Servius on Virgils Eclogues, v. 10, that the leaves of trees, which had previously been called πέταλα, were termed φύλλα in honour of *Phyllis* being turned into a tree. Peacham too imagined *filbert* must come from some proper name, and in a note on his emblems says that "*Philibert*, king of France, caused by arte sundry kinds of them to be brought forth." Had such been the case, the name ought to have been found in French: but this seems to be one of the facts which never existed save in the brain of the

narrator. Johnsons suggestion, that "it probably had its name, like many other fruits, from some one that introduced or cultivated it, and that one *Filbert* or *Filibert* brought it hither," is equally without historical foundation: the existence of such a gardener is merely conjectural; and the word belongs to an age when individuals were seldom commemorated, unless the church led the way by admitting them into its canon. The explanation proposed above is somewhat favourd by the German name, *Lambertsnuss;* which, even if it was originally a corruption of *Lombardsnuss*, a name analogous to *wälsche Nuss* and expressing that the tree was first imported from *Lombardy*, was so distorted because the fruit ripend about *St Lamberts day*, the 17th of September.

When such honour was paid to the inferior saints, of course the Mother of the Saviour, the Queen of Heaven, was not neglected.

> What flower is that which bears the *Virgins* name,
> The richest metal joined with the same?

is proposed as a riddle in Gays first Pastoral, with reference to the *marigold*, the name we commonly give to the *calendula* and *chrysanthemum*. The notion of its following the sun, alluded to in Perditas description, —"The Mary-gold that goes to bed with 'sun, And with him rises, weeping"—is turnd after his own manner by Fuller, in his Good Thoughts in Bad Times, where after referring to the Scriptural account that the grass, herbs, and trees were created on the third day, the sun moon and stars not till the fourth, he adds: "plants were, even when planets were not: it is false that the marigold follows the sun, whereas the sun follows the marigold, as made the day before him."

The riddle in Gay which the other shepherd retorts—

> What flower is that which royal honour craves,
> Adjoin the *Virgin*, and 'tis strown on graves?—

is designd as a description of *rosemary:* and no doubt this association helpt to modify the name; which however

in fact has nothing to do with the Virgin Mary, but is a corruption of the Latin *rosmarinus*. In the Prolegomena to the Catholic Annual indeed it is asserted that *rosemary* was alterd into *rosmarinus* at the time of the Reformation, along with a number of like changes, "in order to divert mens minds from the least recollection of ancient Christian piety." If this be so, the authors of the corruption were so marvellously shrewd and ingenious as to foist their fabrication into the text of Horace and Ovid and Columella and half a dozen passages of Pliny; whose editor has never sented out this strong argument in support of his favorite hypothesis, that the writings of the ancients were in reality written by the moderns. From what Apuleius says of the *rosmarinus*, de Viribus Herbarum, c. 81,—nascitur in locis *marinis*—this has been conceivd to be the origin of the name; and Booth accounts for its first half from its being "seen *glittering with dew on the seashores*." Nor need we doubt the correctness of this explanation, even if we suppose that *ros* was originally a substitution for *rhus*, ῥοῦς, a change of which this would not be a solitary instance. It is singular that though Gay in the first line is alluding merely to the common notion that the *rose* is the queen of flowers, his words might be applied to the *rosemary*, which in Latin bore the epithet of *coronalis*, from being often woven into chaplets, even for statues of the gods, as we see from Ovid, Met. XII. 410, Horace, Od. III. 23. 15, Dioscorides, III. 89. The custom referd to in the second line, of strewing *rosemary* on graves, originated in the belief of the old physicians that it strengthens the memory: for which reason Ophelia and Perdita give *rosemary* "for remembrance," and it was formerly used emblematically in England, and still is so in some provinces of Germany, as Tieck states in his Dramaturgische Blätter, II. 90, at weddings as well as at funerals. There is no end of the allusions to these customs in our old dramatists. *Rosemary* is mentiond as a badge at weddings, by Beaumont and Fletcher in the Knight

of the Burning Pestle, v. 1, at the beginning of the Womans Prize, at the end of the Pilgrim, in the Elder Brother, III. 3, by the authors of Eastward Hoe, III. 1, by Barry in Ram Alley, IV. 1, by Rowley in the Match at Midnight, v. 1, by Mayne in the City Match, v. 1, by Killegrew in the Parsons Wedding, v. 1. In Randolphs Milkmaids Epithalamium the girl prays:

> Love quickly send the time may be
> When I shall *deal my rosemary*.

In Vittoria Corombona on the other hand, v. 1, it is scatterd by Cornelia over the body of her son, and distributed with words borrowd from Ophelias.

> There's *rosemary* for you .. and rue for you ..
> Heartsease for you .. I pray make much of it:
> I've left more for myself.

In the Old Law, IV. 1, Gnotho, alluding to the double character of the herb, gives as a reason for marrying a second wife on the same day on which he was to bury the first, that "there will be charges saved: the same *rosemary* that serves for the funeral will serve for the wedding."

Costmary however, being also termed *herba D. Mariæ*, and in German *Frauenmünze*, is the *costus* or *costum* of the Latins, consecrated to the Virgin Mary. The same herb is called *alecost*, because it is often steept in ale.

The modern Latin name *viola mariana* too, and the English *mariet*, which as well as that of *Mercuries bell* is occasionally given to the *blue-bell*, was most probably in honour of the Virgin.

So was that of *Ladies bedstraw*, which anciently was *our Ladies:* just as *Ladyday*, which Arnold in his Customs of London writes *our Lady day*, is the *Annunciation of the Virgin*.

It is the same with several other flowers. The *adiantum*, so called according to Theophrastus (Hist. of Pl. VII. 14), because its leaves when put in water

continue dry, had also the names of *callitrichon* and *polytrichon*, in consequence of its efficacy, as Pliny tells us (XXII. 30), in beautifying and thickening the hair. In Latin, says Apuleius, c. 47, it is termd *herba capillaris*, or *capillus Veneris*, from its thin, stringy roots: with us it is *Venus hair*, *black maiden hair*, or *our Ladies hair*.

The *carduus lacteus*, which derived its name from its milkwhite spots, was also either on account of them or of its medicinal virtues consecrated to the Virgin, and is called *chardon de Notre Dame* or *chardon Marie* in French, *Frauendistel* (that is, *unserer lieben Frauendistel*) or *Mariendistel* in German, and *our Ladies thistle* in English. Brand says, "the white spots, like drops of milk, on the leaves are vulgarly thought to have arisen from the falling of some drops of the Virgin Marys milk" (Popular Antiq. I. 43): and he supposes this to have been the origin of the name. One would rather believe that the name gave birth to the legend: a parallel one to which is handed down by Maundevile in his Travailes, p. 85, who says that at Bethlehem there is "a chirche of Seynt Nicholas, where oure Lady rested hire aftre sche was lyghted of oure Lord. And for as meche as sche had to meche mylk in hire pappes, that greved hire, sche mylked hem on the rede stones of marble; so that the traces may zit be sene in the stones alle whyte." The fablers of ancient times accounted in a like manner for the *Milky Way*. According to Eratosthenes, says Hyginus, Poet. Astron. II. 43, when Mercury was an infant, Juno ignorant of his parentage was giving him suck: but on learning that he was the son of Maia, she cast him from her, and the glory of the milk that then gusht from her is still seen among the stars. Others related that Hercules was placed at her breast when she was asleep, and that on her waking what has just been described took place: while others said that Hercules in his greediness suckt in so much milk that he could not hold it in his mouth, and that thus it ran over and traced

a circle in the heavens. Others again reported that when Ops brought Saturn a stone instead of her child, he orderd her to suckle it, and that its pressure against her breast squeezed out the milk, of which we still see the memorial in the galaxy. All which fables are merely mythical interpretations of a fanciful name.

Our Ladies slipper, so called from the shape of the flower, is the *calceolus Mariæ*, or *Cypripedium:* for that which had been consecrated to Venus, was often transferd in the middle ages to the Virgin Mary. In Germany the same plant is sometimes *Venusschuh*, sometimes *Marienschuh*, *Marienpantoffel.*

Ladies mantle too must be *our Ladies;* for it is *Marienmantel* in German. The latter half of its name alludes to its broad indented leaves, which "before they be opened (says Gerarde) are plaited and folded together, not unlike to the leaves of mallows."

Our Ladies seal (*sigillum Mariæ*) is among the names of the black briony; owing to the great efficacy of its root when spred in a plaster and applied as it were to *seal up* a scar or bruise.

In like manner *Solomons seal*, *sigillum Salomonis*, *sceau de Solomon*, *Salomons-siegel*, was so called in part from having marks on the roots something like the stamp of a seal, but still more, as Gerarde maintains, "of the singular vertue that the root hath in *sealing* or healing up greene wounds, broken bones, and such like, being stampt and laid thereon." Perhaps this was compared to the magical powers ascribed in the Arabian stories to Solomons seal.

The *paliurus*, or *Libyan rhamnus*, is reported by ancient tradition to be the plant of which the crown of thorns was made, and has accordingly receivd the name of *Christs thorn.* Belon de Mans, whose travels were publisht in 1554, says, II. 88: "cherchant les plantes en tournoyant les murs de Jerusalem, et les examinant diligemment, pource que je desiroye sçavoir quelles espines je trouveroye, pour entendre de quelle espece estoit celle dont fut faicte la couronne de nostre Seigneur, et n'y

ayant trouvé rien d'espineux, plus frequent que le *Rhamnus*, dont m'a semblé que sa couronne fust d'un tel arbre: car je n'y ay veu croistre nulles ronces ou autre chose espineuse. Il y a bien quelques capriers espineux, parquoy voyant que les Italiens appellent vulguairement le *Rhamnus*, *spina sancta*, et principalement entour Maceraca et à Pezaro, auquel lieu ay trouvé les hayes n'estre faictes d'autres arbres, comme aussi en Jerusalem, l'ay bien voulu mettre en ce passage, joinct que les anciens Arabes nomment l'arbre duquel fut faicte la couronne, *Alhansegi*, que les interpretes tournent en Latin, *corona spinea*." At present, according to Buckingham (c. XVIII), the prevalent opinion among the Christians in Palestine is that the crown of thorns was made of the *myrobalanum;* which is spoken of by Josephus (B. J. IV. 8) as abounding in the neighbourhood of Jericho, and of the berries of which rosaries and chaplets are made, and sold at the door of the Holy Sepulcre. As it does not appear however that this plant is found about Jerusalem, the older tradition may safely be preferd. Sir John Maundevile, who was on his travels from 1322 to 1356, in speaking of the crown which was then preservd as a relic, gives us a curious sample of legendary lore. "Zif alle it be so, that men seyn that this croune is of thornes, zee schulle undirstonde that it was of *jonkes of the see*, that is to sey, *rushes of the see*, that prykke nals scharpely as thornes. For I have seen and beholden many tymes that of Parys, and that of Costantynoble: for thei were bothe on, made of russches of the see: but men han departed hem in two parties. And I have on of tho precyouse thornes, that semethe licke a white thorn; and that was zoven to me for gret specyaltee. For there are many of hem broken and fallen into the vesselle that the croune lythe in: for thei breken for dryenesse, whan men meven hem, to schewen hem to grete lordes that comen thidre. And zee schulle undirstonde that oure Lord Jesu, in that nyghte that he was taken, was ylad in to a gardyn; and there he was first examyned righte scharply; and there the Jewes scorned

him, and maden him a crowne of *albespyne*, that is *white thorn*, that grew in that same gardyn, and setten it on his heved, so faste and so sore, that the blood ran down be many places of his visage, and of his necke, and of his schuldres. And therfore hath white thorn many vertues: for he that berethe a braunche on him thereoffe, no thondre ne no maner of tempest may dare him; ne in the hows that it is inne, may non evylle gost entre ne come unto the place that it is inne. Aftreward was oure Lord lad forthe before the bisschoppes and the maystres of the lawe in to another gardyn of Anne: and there also he was examyned, repreved, and scorned, and crouned eft with a white thorn, that men clepethe *barbarynes*, that hathe also manye vertues. And afterward he was lad in to a gardyn of Cayphas, and there he was crouned with *eglentier*. And aftre he was lad in to the chambre of Pylate, and there he was examynd and crouned. And the Jewes setten him in a chayere and cladde him in a mantelle; and there made thei the croune of *jonkes of the see;* and there thei kneled to him, and skornede him, seyenge, *heyl Kyng of Jewes*. And of this croune half is at Parys, and the other half at Costantynoble. And this croune had Crist on his heved, whan he was done upon the cros: and therfore oughte men to worschipe it and holde it more worthi than ony of the othere," pp. 16–18. This is an ingenious specimen of the manner in which the pretensions of contending claimants are to be adjusted.

The *passion flower* too was associated with the crucifixion: Johnson, the editor of Gerarde, tells us that "the Spanish friers in America first called it *flos passionis*, and in a counterfeit figure, by adding what was wanting, made it as it were an epitome of our Saviours Passion."

The name of *oculus Christi* given to the wild clary is owing to its efficacy in purging the eyes; for which purpose it was used by the ancients, according to Dioscorides, III. 145. "The seede (says Gerarde) put whole into the eies clenseth and purgeth them exceedingly from

waterish humours, rednesse, inflammation, and divers other maladies, or all that happen unto the eies, and takes away the paine and smarting thereof, especially being put into the eies one seed at one time, and no more, which is a generall medicine in Cheshire and other countries thereabout, knowne of all, and used with good successe."

There are also two plants called *palma Christi;* the *satyrion,* because the shape of its roots, the *ricinus,* because that of its leaves resembles the human hand.

Among pears too one is called the *Boncretien* or *good Christian,* to which La Quintinye gives the precedence before all other pears, justifying his decision by its name. "For (he says, in Evelyns translation, p. 79) if, as I may so call it, the antiquity of its known extraction may be counted for any advantage to it in this cause, then without doubt our *Boncretien* may in that particular pretend itself much more noble than all the other pears. For though probably all fruits were created in one and the same day, yet 'tis certain that they were not all known at the same time, but some sooner and others later: and this pear was one of the first that by its singular excellencies gained the admiration and courtship of the world: the great monarchies, and principally that of old Rome, having known and cultivated it under the name of *Crustumium* or *Volenum;* so that in all appearance it often made a noble figure among those conquering people, in the magnificent entertainments they usually made, as well to set out the splendor of their triumphs, as to do honour to the tributary kings which often came to pay their homage to those masters of the world. In the second place, the great and illustrious name which it has ever borne ever since so many ages, and with which it seems to have been baptized at the very birth of Christianity itself, how can it but imprint in all a veneration for it, and especially in all Christian gardeners?" Nevertheless, in spite of its merits, one may fairly suspect that the name *bonchretien,* or *chretien,* as it was called

in Poitou, was a not unnatural corruption of the Roman name. The *pirum Crustumium* is spoken of by Virgil, Georg. II. 88: by Columella, v. 10; and Pliny, XXIII. 62, it is called *Crustuminum*; and the latter says that when stewed it is remarkably wholesome and pleasant.

The ἀκρίδες or locusts on which St John fed in the wilderness, were conjectured in very early ages to be, not an animal, but a vegetable substance: though the insect is spoken of as an article of food in Leviticus, XI. 22; by Aristophanes, Ach. 1116; by Strabo, Diodorus, and Pliny. The Ebionites maintaind that ἀκρίδες is a mistake for ἐγκρίδες, cakes of a certain kind. Many of the Greek fathers supposed that ἀκρίδες was the same as ἀκρόδρυα, the young shoots of trees: while others took the ἀκρὶς to be a particular sort of tree, the fruit of which was the food of the Baptist. It is in conformity with the last of these opinions that the carob tree bears the name of *St Johns bread.* A similar opinion is implied in the proverbial expression used by Osborn in his Memoirs of James, §. 14; where he says that "one of the reasons given why the most Christian king advertised James of the Gunpowder Plot, was lest he should exchange *herb John* for *coloquintida*," and not find his successor equally manageable. This passage is referd to by Douce (II. 269) to illustrate Iagos words, I. 3—"The food that to him now is as lushious as *locusts*, shal be to him shortly as bitter as *coloquintida:*" where by *locusts* is clearly meant the fruit of the *locust* tree. Douce also quotes Tomlinson as saying that many superstitious persons call mugwort *St Johns herb*, "wherewith he circumcinged his loyns on holidays." In France the same plant is called *herbe de St Jean*, in Germany *Johanniskraut* and *Johannisgurtel*; and Adelung says the common people make girdles of it to wear on the feast of the Baptist. This plant, the *artemisia* of the ancients, was held even by them to be endowd with magical powers. Pliny says, XXVI. 89, that a traveler who has it bound about him is reported to be insensible

to fatigue; and again, xxv. 81, that no charm can hurt him, nor any wild beast, nor even the sun.

The *Judas tree*, *Judasbaum*, was believed to be the tree on which Judas hung himself. Another tradition however related that it was on the elder; and Maundevile says, p. 112, that between Jerusalem and the valley of Jehosaphat "is zit the *tree of eldre*, that Judas henge himself upon." Hence the fungus on elder-trees, which has some sort of resemblance to the human ear, was called *auricula Judæ*, *Judas-ohr*, *Judas ear*, or by contraction *Jews ear*. This Bacon (Nat. Hist. §. 554.) describes as "an herb that groweth upon the roots and lower parts of the bodies of trees; especially of elders, and sometimes ashes. It hath a strange propertie: for in warm water it swelleth and openeth extremely, It is not green, but of a duskie brown colour. And it is used for squinancies and inflammations in the throat: whereby it seemeth to have a mollifying and lenifying vertue." It is mentiond along with other fungusses in the Lancashire Witches: "all the sallets are turn'd to Jewes-ears, mushrooms, and puckfists." Brand (Pop. Antiq. II. 587) quotes the following question from a collection of Philosophical Problems: "Why are Jews said to stink naturally? Is it because the *Jews-ears* grow on stinking *elder*, which tree that fox-headed Judas was falsely supposed to have hanged himself on; and so that natural stink has been entailed on them and their posterities, as it were *ex Traduce?*" Sir T. Brown in his Vulgar Errors, II. 2, where he speaks of this fungus, makes at the same time some good remarks on several other names of plants. "An herb there is commonly called *Pauls Betony:* hereof the people have some conceit in reference to St Paul; whereas that name is derived from Paulus Ægineta, an antient physician of Ægina, and is no more than *speedwell* or *fluellin*. The like expectations are raised from *herba Trinitatis;* which notwithstanding obtaineth that name

from the figure of its leaves, and is one kind of *liver-wort* or *hepatica*. In *milium solis* the epithete of the sun hath enlarged its opinion: which hath indeed no reference thereunto, it being no more than *lithospermon*, or *grummel*, or rather *milium soler*; which, as Serapion from Aben Juliel hath taught us, because it grew plentifully in the mountains of Soler, received that appellation. In *Jews-ears* something is conceived extraordinary from the name, which is in propriety but *fungus sambucinus*, or an excrescence about the roots of elder, and concerneth not the nation of the Jews, but Judas Iscariot, upon a conceit he hanged on this tree; and is become a famous medicine in quinsies, sore throats, and strangulations ever since. And so are they deceived in the name of *horse-radish*, *horse-mint*, *bull-rush*, and many more: conceiving therein some prenominal consideration, whereas that expression is but a Grecism, by the prefix of ἵππος or βοῦς, that is, *horse* and *bull*, intending no more than great. According whereto the *great* dock is called *hippolapathum*; and he that calls the horse of Alexander, *Great-head*, expresseth the same which the Greeks do in *Bucephalus*."

It has also been matter of much controversy what was the fruit eaten in Paradise; and more than one tree has obtaind the name of *Adams apple*. "In Egypt (says Maundevile, p. 59, who on such matters has preserved an invaluable record of the popular belief of the middle ages), and in othere contrees also, men fynden longe apples to selle in hire cesoun: and men clepen hem *apples of Paradys*; and thei ben righte swete and of gode savour. And thoghe zee kutte hem in never so many gobettes or parties, overthwart or end longes, evermore zee schulle fynden in the myddes the figure of the holy cros of oure Lord Jesu. But thei wil roten within 8 days: and for that cause men may not carye of the apples to no fer contrees. And men fynden there also the *appulle tree of Adam*, that han a byte at on of the sydes. And there ben also fyge trees, that beren no leves, but fyges upon the smale

braunches, and men clepen hem *fyges of Pharoon.*" And in another place, p. 13, he tells us that "the Cristene men that dwellen bezond the see, in Grece, seyn that the tree of the cros, that we callen *cypresse*, was of that *tree that Adam ete the appulle of.* And they seyn also, that here Scripture seythe that Adam was seek, and seyde to his sone Sethe that he scholde go to the aungelle that kepte Paradys, that he wolde senden him oyle of mercy, for to anoynte with his membres, that he myghte have hele. And Sethe wente. But the Aungelle wolde not late him come in; but seyd to him, that he myghte not have of the oyle of mercy. But he toke him three greynes of the same tree that his fadre eet the appelle offe; and bad him, als sone as his fadre was ded, that he scholde putte theise three greynes undre his tonge, and grave him so: and he dide. And of theise three greynes sprong a tree, as the aungelle seyde that it scholde, and bere a fruyt thorghe the whiche fruyt Adam scholde be saved. And whan Sethe cam azen, he fonde his fadre nere ded. And whan he was ded, he did with the greynes as the aungelle bad him; of the whiche sprongen three trees, of the whiche the cros was made, that bare gode fruyt and blessed, oure Lord Jesu Crist; thorghe whom Adam and alle that comen of him scholde be saved and delyvered from drede of dethe withouten ende, but it be here own defaute." Some other versions of the same legend are given by Southey in the Omniana, §. 146. These points are discust by Sir T. Brown, VII. 1, after his own inimitable manner. "That the forbidden fruit was an apple is commonly believed, confirmed by tradition, perpetuated by writings, verses, pictures; and some have been so bad prosodians, as from thence to derive the Latin word *malum*, because that fruit was the first occasion of evil. Some have conceived it a vine, in the mystery of whose fruit lay the expiation of the transgression. Again, some fruits pass under the name of *Adams apples*, which in common acception admit not that appellation: the one described

by Matthiolus under the name of *pomum Adami*, a very fair fruit, not unlike a citron, but somewhat rougher, chopt and cranied, vulgarly conceived the marks of Adams teeth; another, the fruit of that plant which Serapion termeth *musa*, but the Eastern Christians commonly the *apples of Paradise*, not resembling an apple in figure, and in taste a melon or cowcumber. Which fruits although they have received appellations suitable unto the tradition, yet we cannot from thence infer they were this fruit in question: no more than *arbor vitæ* to obtain its name from the *tree of life* in Paradise, or *arbor Judæ* to be the same which supplied the gibbet unto Judas. In the text is only particulared, that it was the fruit of a tree good for food, and pleasant unto the eye, in which regards many excell the apple; therefore learned men do wisely conceive it inexplicable; and Philo puts determination unto despair, when he affirmeth the same kind of fruit was never produced since. Surely were it not requisite to have been concealed, it had not passed unspecified, nor the tree revealed which concealed their nakedness, and that concealed which revealed it: for in the same chapter mention is made of figleaves. So in vain we enquire of what wood was Moses rod, or the tree that sweetned the waters. Or, though tradition or humane history might afford some light, whether the crown of thorns was made of *paliurus*, whether the cross of Christ were made of those four woods in the distich of Durantes —the cedar, cypress, olive, and palm—or only of oak, according unto Lipsius and Goropius, we labour not to determine. For though hereof prudent symbols and pious allegories be made by wiser conceivers, yet common heads will flie unto superstitious applications, and hardly avoid miraculous or magical expectations. Now the ground that occasioned this expression by an apple, might be the community of this fruit, which is often taken for any other. So the goddess of gardens is termed *Pomona:* so the proverb expresseth it, *to give apples unto Alcinous:* so the fruit which Paris decided

was called *an apple:* so in the garden of Hesperides (which many conceive a fiction drawn from Paradise) we read of *golden apples* guarded by the dragon. So when from a basket of summer-fruits, or *apples*, God by Amos foretold the destruction of his people, we cannot say they had any reference unto the fruit of Paradise; but thereby was declared the propinquity of their desolation, and that their tranquillity was of no longer duration than those horary or soon decaying fruits of summer. Since therefore after this fruit curiosity vainly enquireth, and confidence blindly determineth, we shall surcease our inquisition, rather troubling ourselves that it was tasted, than troubling ourselves in its decision."

The *Carline* thistle too has a legend to account for its name: Matthiolus, on Dioscorides III. 9, says the common people, as they are wont, believe that, when the army of Charlemagne was afflicted by a pestilence, this herb was pointed out to him by an angel as the best of all antidotes against it. On the strength of this, he adds, they bestow the highest praises on this plant for its efficacy against the plague. Can this tradition about Charlemagne be traced to any old poem?

Goats beard, which Theophrastus (VII. 7. 1) says derived its Greek name τραγοπώγων from its long white beard, is well described by Gerarde: "the floures grow at the top of the stalkes, consisting of a number of purple leaves, dasht over as it were with a little yellow dust, set about with nine or ten sharpe pointed greene leaves: the whole floure resembles a star when it is spred abroad, (hence its name, the *Star of Jerusalem*); for it shutteth itselfe at twelve of the clocke, and sheweth not his face open untill the next dayes sun doth make it floure anew, whereupon it was called *Go to bed at noon:* when these floures be come to their full maturitie and ripeness, they grow into a downy blow-ball, like those of dandelion, which is carried away with the winde." Its name *Josephs flower* seems to owe its origin to the pictures in which the

husband of Mary was represented as a long-bearded old man.

A fanciful resemblance between the form of the grain and that of a tear, gave rise to the name *Jobs tears:* the grains were imagind to drop out, as Jobs "eye pourd out tears unto God."

A similar association is implied in the name *Junos tears*, given to the *vervain*, which seems to have been dedicated to Juno Lucina by some physician on account of its medical virtues in hysterical cases. The Latin *verbena* was a generic name for all plants used in religious ceremonies, and does not appear to have been ever restricted to one particular sort.

Several other names of plants connected with classical mythology are still retaind amongst us.

The *anthyllis* or *silver bush* is commonly called *Jupiters beard*, by the Germans *Jupiters bart.* The same name used to be given to the *sempervivum* or *houseleek.* From the Latin *Jovis barba* came its French name *Joubarbe:* and as *dies Jovis* became *Donnerstag* in Germany, so *barba Jovis* was turnd into *Donnersbart.* This, along with its other name, *Hauswurz*, which answers to our *houseleek*, gave rise to a vulgar superstition, that a house on which it grew was safe from lightning. Another name of the house-leek, *Jupiters eye*, is said by the Greek translator of the treatise on plants among Aristotles works to be the Italian name for the *sempervivum.* Την χρυσοκόμην Διὸς γένεια καλοῦσιν οἱ Ἰταλοὶ, ἵνα μὴ τάχα δοκῶσιν ὑβρίζειν τῷ ξυροῦσθαι τὰς πώγωνας· λέγουσι γὰρ ἀείζωον τὸ μεγὰ Διὸς ὀφθαλμούς. And this agrees with Plinys description of the plant which he calls *Jovis barba:* "in opere topiario tonsilis, et in rotunditatem spissa, argenteo folio." XVI. 31.

A sort of clary too is called *Jupiters distaff*, because the top of the stalk looks something like a distaff with yellow flax wrapt round it.

Venuses name again is still given to a variety of flowers. The teazle is called *Venus bason*, from its

leaves growing together so as to present something like the shape of a bason. *Adiantum*, or *our Ladies Hair*, is also *Venus Hair*, in Germany *Venus-Haar*. The *scandix*, or *shepherds needle*, is likewise termed *Venus comb*, in consequence of its long spiked seeds growing in a row, like the teeth of a comb. And one of the campanulas has received the pretty name of *Venus looking-glass*; probably from its spreading open so widely in the day-time. A sort of *cynoglossum* too, called κοτυλήδων or κῆπος Ἀφροδίτης by the Greeks, is mentiond in the treatise on herbs ascribed to Apuleius, c. 43, under the name of *umbilicus Veneris*, which in English is renderd by *Venus navelwort*, in German by *Venus-Nabel*.

Bion in his epitaph on Adonis represents the rose as springing from his blood, and the anemone from the tears shed over him by Venus. This led to the application of the name *Adonis-Blume*, *Adonis flower*, sometimes to the anemone, sometimes to the red camomile which resembles the anemone and might easily be supposed to be tinted with blood. Among the Greeks the lettuce also is said by Hesychius to have been occasionally termed Ἀδωνιάς. This name arose from the practice of carrying pots of lettuce, fennel, and other like herbs, at the festival of Adonis: whence they were called the *gardens of Adonis*, Ἀδώνιδος κῆποι. Such pots, perhaps of flowers, are the ἁπαλοὶ κῆποι πεφυλαγμένοι ἐν ταλαρίσκοις Χρυσείοις, described in Theocritus (xv. 102.) as having been placed by Berenice beside the image of the god. It is in allusion to this custom that Socrates in the Phædrus (p. 276. b) asks: "Will a sensible husbandman plant the seeds, which he cares for and wishes to bear fruit, in summer-time hurriedly in the *gardens of Adonis*, and then exult at seeing them sprout up finely within eight days? or will he not rather, if he plant such seeds at all, do it for the sake of amusement or of a festival? while that which he is in earnest about, he sows according to the rules of agriculture in a suitable soil, and is content

if he sees it reaching its prime in eight months." This passage, like so many others in Plato, gave birth to a proverbial expression; and the *gardens of Adonis* became a byword for anything that sprouts up and decays rapidly. It is applied solely in the former sense by Shakspeare in Henry the Sixth, F. P. I. 6, where Charles says to the Pucelle,

> Thy promises are like *Adonis gardens*,
> That one day bloom'd, and fruitfull were the next.

These potherbs seem to have been the origin of the story which told of the beautiful gardens of Adonis. Pliny, who graspt so much and workt so rapidly that in spite of his vast learning he now and then fell into a blunder, seems to have misunderstood the nature of Ἀδώνιδος κῆποι, when he mentiond the *gardens of Adonis*, along with those of the Hesperides and of Alcinous, as objects of great admiration among the ancients (XIX. 19). And it was perhaps this expression of Pliny, combined with the allegorical interpretations of the legend of Adonis, that gave rise to Spensers description of his gardens in the Faerie Queene, III. 6. The same gardens he mentions in another place, II. 10. 71, when recounting the origin of elves and fays, as the spot where the first Elfe found the first Fay, being probably influenced by the similarity of sound between *Adonis* and *Eden*. Nor had Milton any other authority for "those *gardens feign'd of reviv'd Adonis*," with which he compares Paradise, P. L. IX. 440. So that, as far as antiquity is concernd, Bentley is perfectly right in his objection to that passage. A few pots of mignonette are quite as splendid as the real κῆποι Ἀδώνιδος. It is clear however from the epithet, *revived*, that Milton had Spensers description, and no doubt Marinos also, in his mind.

Hercules woundwort or *Hercules all-heal* is supposed to be the same as the πάνακες Ηράκλειον of Theophrastus; who says (IX. 11) there are several πανάκη, one called Χειρώνειον (after Chiron), another

Ἀσκληπίειον (after Esculapius), a third Ἡράκλειον. The last epithet must have been meant to designate the potency of the herb. For a similar reason a sort of poppy was termed Ἡρακλεία (Theophrastus IX. 12): so was a thorn (Theophrastus IV. 4): and the ancient name of the magnet, λίθος Ἡρακλεία, had no doubt the very same import. By Pliny plants with like names are said to have been discoverd by Hercules, or Chiron, or Esculapius: XXV. 11–20. By others the name of Ἡρακλεία is deduced from some town of Heraclea: but in that case it would have been Ἡρακλεῶτις.

The application of Mercuries name to plants may be traced back to classical antiquity. Dioscorides (IV. 191) says the λινόζωστις was also called Ἑρμοῦ βοτάνιον: and Pliny (XXV. 18) tells us, "apud Græcos Hermupoan multi vocant eam, apud nos omnes *Mercurialem.*" Hence its Italian name *Mercorella*, its French name *Mercuriale*, and ours, *herb Mercury.*

Another plant, something like the former, and by the French termed *Mercuriale sauvage*, or *chou de chien*, the κυνοκράμβη of the Greeks, is our *wild Mercury* or *dogs Mercury.*

So natural indeed is the feeling which leads us to invest plants with human names and human attributes, that the Greeks even went so far as to invent human originals for their favorite flowers; and then they devised beautiful legends to account for *Hyacinthus* and *Narcissus* and *Daphne* and *Syrinx* being changed into the plants said to be called after them:

> And all about grew every sort of flowre
> To which sad lovers were transformde of yore:
> Fresh *Hyacinthus*, Phœbus paramoure
> And dearest love;
> Foolish *Narcisse*, that likes the watery shore:

as Spenser sings, F. Q. III. 6. 45. And, as Webster says,

> We read how *Daphne*, for her peevish flight,
> Became a fruitless baytree: *Syrinx* turnd
> To the pale empty reed. *Duchess of Malfy* III. 2.

In mineralogy too we meet with fanciful names derived from classical mythology. Transparent pieces of rock crystal inclosing silky and hairlike tufts and lines, when these filaments are green, are called *cheveux de Thetis;* when they are silvery fibres of amiantus, *cheveux de Venus;* and when they are red needles of rutile, *cheveux de Mars.*

In the mechanical arts again a variety of things derive their names from their inventors or from their introducers; of which a few instances have already been quoted. This is more especially the case with such things as depend for their currency in great measure on the caprices of fashion, which a name may often conciliate or controul.

Several dishes and other things appertaining to cookery are called after the persons by whom or at whose houses they were first introduced.

Sandwiches and *negus* have already been mentiond.

The marquis de *Bechamelle,* who was maître d' hôtel to Louis XIV, has given name to a variety of dishes and sauces.

Sauce Robert records the fame of the person who of late years has been one of the most celebrated among the worthies of the kitchen.

Maintenon cutlets appear to be so called in honour of Madame de Maintenon.

A vessel for keeping gravy hot is termed an *Argyle.*

A particular sort of coffee-biggin too is called a *Didon.* Not however that the origin of this machine can be traced back to the queen of Carthage: the name only records that the first which was brought to England was taken at the capture of the Didon frigate.

It is much the same with articles of dress.

The red cloak worn by women of the lower orders must derive its name from a period anterior to the

Reformation: for it is still called a *cardinal*, the scarlet robe being the most conspicuous part of a cardinals dress.

Spencers were first brought into fashion by Lord Robert Spencer about the year 1790.

A yellow silk neck-kerchief with white and black spots used to be called a *belcher*, as having been first introduced by the celebrated boxer.

In Vandycks female portraits one often sees a laced neck-kerchief, something like the large falling bands worn in his age by the men. When this was revived half a century ago by Lady Dysert, who, Granger says, took the shape of hers from a portrait of Henrietta Maria, it was called not inappropriately a *vandyck*. The term *vandyck* at present is applied chiefly if not exclusively to a pointed edging.

An ornament for the forehead with a drop is called a *sevigné*, from having been usually worn by the admirable letter-writer, on the prints of whom it is often seen.

In Anquetils Louis XIV, under the year 1680, it is said that one day when Mademoiselle de Fontange was on a hunting party with the king, "le vent detacha sa coiffure: elle se la fit attacher avec un ruban, dont les nœuds tomboient sur le front. Cette singularité plut si fort au roi, qu'il la pria de ne se pas coiffer autrement tout le jour; et, dès le lendemain, toutes les dames parurent coiffées avec des *fontanges*." This name was imported along with the fashion into England; and Addison in the Spectator, No 98, makes use of it as a term for a high head-dress, in translating a passage from Paradins Annales de Bourgogne, Liv. III. p. 701, where he says that friar Thomas Cornette, a Carmelite, who was afterward burnt at Rome, directed his sermons especially "à descrier les coifures des dames et damoyselles de ce temps là: car tout le monde estoit fort lors desbordé en accoustremens. Et surtout les accoustremens de teste des dames estoyent estranges. Car elles portoyent de hauts atours (which Addison by anticipation

renders *fontanges*) de la longueur d' une aulne ou environ, aiguz commes clochers, desquels dependoyent par derrière de longs crespes à riches franges, comme estandars. Ce prescheur avoit ceste façon de coifure en tel horreur, que la pluspart de ses sermons s' addressoyent à ces atours, lesquels il nommoit les *Hennins*. Et pour les rendre plus odieux il attiltroit les petis enfans, esquels il donnoit petis presens pour crier et faire la huee contre ces Hennins. Dont les dames atournees n'osoyent plus sortir en public, et ne venoyent point au sermon de ce frere Thomas que desguisees, et avec coifure de simple linge, comme les femmes de bas estat. Chose qui profita jusques à ce que ce prescheur fust party. Mais apres son partement les dames releverent leurs cornes, et firent comme les lymaçons, lesquels quand ils entendent quelque bruit, retirent et reserrent tout bellement leurs cornes, mais, le bruit passé, soudain ils les relevent plus grandes que devant. Ainsi firent les dames: car les Hennins et atours ne furent jamais plus grandes, plus pompeux et superbes, qu' apres le partement de frere Thomas. Voylà que l' on gaigne de s'oppiniastrer contre l'oppiniastrerie d' aucunes cervelles."

When riding-habits were first introduced, Addison pointed his pen against them, both in the Spectator and Guardian. He terms it an amphibious and *hermaphroditical* dress: Spectator, No 435. Gay in the Guardian, No 149, rather chooses to call it "the *Pindaric*, as its first institution was at a Newmarket horserace, and as it is a mixture of the sublimity of the epic with the easy softness of the ode." In France it is styled an *Amazone:* in Germany an *Amazonen-kleid*, and the wearer of it an *Amazone;* as is well known to the readers of Wilhelm Meister, where Natalie for a long time is spoken of under no other name.

The *Monmouth* or military cock of the hat was the fashion in Charles the seconds time, and was so called after his unfortunate son. Addison, in the Spectator, No 129, remarking on the long continuance of obsolete

fashions in the remoter counties, says: "During our progress through the most western parts of the kingdom we fancied ourselves in King Charles the Seconds reign. The smartest of the country squires appear still in the *Monmouth cock*."

A page before he says that at Staines "he observed a young fellow with a tolerable periwig, had it not been covered with a hat that was shaped in the *Ramillie cock*." Here the name was given in honour of Marlboroughs victory: it was so popular, that when the size of the mens wigs was curtaild, and some of the long flowing curls were tied up, these were at first called *Ramillie wigs*, being much like what were subsequently termed *tie-wigs*.

Another by-gone fashion is commemorated in the same number of the Spectator. The *Steenkirk* is said to have just arrived at Newcastle: this was a black silk military cravat, so named in honour of the battle of Steenkirk.

In the preface to All for Love, Dryden after some criticisms on the Phedre says: "I should not have troubled myself thus far with French poets, but that I find our *Chedreux* critics wholly form their judgements by them." When we recollect the age Dryden was writing in, we cease to wonder that the word he selected to designate the fashionable critics of the day, should have been the name of a peruke-maker. For it was at the beginning of the period in which Pope, when enumerating in the Rape of the Lock, I. 101, the "varying vanities" with which the Sylphs "shift the moving toyshop of the female heart," could place at the head of the list:

> There *wigs* with *wigs*, with swordknots swordknots strive,
> Beaux banish beaux, and coaches coaches drive.

Among some interesting reminiscences of deceast poets printed in the Gentlemans Magazine, xv. 99, the writer says: "I remember plain John Dryden before he paid his court with success to the great, in one uniform

clothing of Norwich drugget. I have eat tarts with him and Madam Reeve at the Mulberry Garden, when he advanced to a sword and *chadreux wig*. Posterity is absolutely mistaken as to that great man: though forced to be a satirist, he was the mildest creature breathing, and the readiest to help the young and deserving: though his comedies are horribly full of *double entendres*, it was owing to a false complaisance for a dissolute age. He was in company the modestest man that ever conversed." Malone, who refers to this passage, remarks (Life of Dryd. p. 467) that this wig was probably so called after some Frenchman, by whom it was made; as in later times the *Valency wig* and the *Deuville* derived their names from their makers." In two little pamphlets entitled Mundus Muliebris and Mundus Foppensis, publisht in 1690 and 1691, the former of which was written by Evelyn, as appears from his Memoirs, I. 553, one finds some doggerel lines on the fashions of the age, with glossaries explaining the peculiar terms: and in the latter of these poems it is said:

> Hang *perriwig*, 'tis only fit
> For barbers tongues that ne'er spoke wit:
> But if you'd be i' th' fashion, choose
> The far politer term, *Chedreux*.

Sir Walter Scott in his Dryden refers to Shadwells Bury Fair, I. 2, where a French peruke-maker says: "You talke of de *Chedreux;* he is nobodie to me. Dere is no man can travaille vis mee. Monsieur Wildish has got my peruke on his head. Let me see: here is de haire, de curle, de brucle; ver good, ver good. If dat foole *Chedreux* make de peruke like me, I vil be hanga."

A *caxon* too probably owes its name to some wig-maker.

In the same Mundus Muliebris a man, who "will needs to *Marry-Land* adventure," is told that he must not

> ——*demy Sultane*, Spagnolet,
> Nor fringe to sweep the Mall forget;

that he must fit out his bride with

> Twice twelve day-smocks of Holland fine,
> With cambric sleeves, rich point to join,
> For she despises *Colbertine;*
> Nor reckon it among the baubles,
> A *palatine* also of sables.—
> Of ribbon various echelles,
> Gloves trimm'd and laced, as fine as Nell's:
> Twelve dozen *Martial*, whole and half,
> Of jonquil, tuberose, (don't laugh),
> *Frangipan*, orange, violet,
> Narcissus, jassemin, ambrett;
> And some of chicken-skin for night,
> To keep her hands plump, soft, and white:—
> The settee, cupee place aright,
> *Frelange, fontange, favorite;*
> *Monté la haut*, and palisade
> Sorti, *flandan*, great helps to trade;
> *Bourgoigne*, jardiné, cornett,
> *Frilal* next upper pinner set.

Of these names it is probable that several came from persons, whose glory has unfortunately past away. *Fontange* has already been explaind.

Martial is said in the Fops Dictionary to be the name of a famous French perfumer, emulating the *Frangipani* at Rome: his fame is still recorded in *marechal powder* and *pomatum*. In France a particular sort of pomatum is called *pomade de frangipane*, in honour of the Marchese Frangipani, a Roman, the inventor of the perfume with which it, and the *gans de frangipane* are sented. Balzac in a letter to Madame Desloges, VII. 34, says "Monsieur * * * se fit hier vostre tributaire, et s'obligea de vous envoyer tous les ans une raisonnable quantité de ses pastilles. Si vous les trouvez bonnes, elles auront plus de reputation que n' en ont les *gans de Frangipani*. Mais parce que vos gens de Limousin se pourroient icy equivoquer, vous les advertirez, s'il vous plaist, que ce parfumeur a trente mille livres de rente, et que ce gantier est Seigneur Romain, Mareschal de Camp des armées du Roy, parent de Sainct Gregoire

le Grand, et, ce que j' estime plus que tout cela, un des plus honnestes hommes du monde." May it not have been after this *Mareschal* de Camp that *marechal powder* was so called? In a Latin poem addrest to Voiture by Cerisante, in which he speaks of having abandond love for war, these gloves are among the things he boasts that he has thrown aside:

> Amice, nil me, sicut antea, juvat
> Pulvere vel Cyprio comam nitentem pectere;
> Vel quas Britannus texuit subtiliter
> Mille modis varias jactare ventis tænias;
> *Vel quam perunxit Frangipanes ipsemet*
> *Pelle* manum gracilem coram puellis promere;
> Vel delibuto roribus jasmineis
> Mungere linteolo nares licet non humidas.

Le Laboureur in his additions to Castelnaus Memoirs, p. 705, tells us the inventor of the perfume was the last Marchese Frangipani, and that he remaind a bachelor because he would not soil blood that was connected with the archdukes of Austria, the kings of Spain, and the emperors of Constantinople, by intermarrying with the upstart families which had recently sprung up at Rome to the disgrace of the ancient Roman nobility. The fashionableness of *marshal gloves* appears from Sedleys Bellamira (1687). "I gave her but a dozen pair of *marshal gloves* (says Keepwell, I. 1), and she was in the purest humour all day." "I met the prettiest creature in New Spring Garden (exclaims Cunningham, I. 3)! her *gloves right marshal*, her petticoat of the new rich Indian stuffs, her fan colambor: *angel-water* was the worst scent about her." The perfumes and pulvilio of the fops of those days are perpetual subjects of derision in the comedies of the age. Of the perfumed gloves for instance we hear again in Ethereges Man of Mode, III. 2, where Sir Fopling Flutter enumerates the most celebrated dressmakers of the day. "He wears nothing but what are originals of the most famous hands in Paris.—You are in the right, Madam.—The suit?—*Barroy*.—The garniture?—*Le Gras*.—The shoes?—*Piccar*.—

The perriwig?—*Chedreux.*—The gloves?—*Orangerie:* you know the smell, ladies." Menage also speaks of gloves called *gans de Neroli*, after the princess of Nerola, duchess of Bracciano, "qui en a inventé le parfum."

A *palatine* Evelyn describes to be what previously had been termed a tippet, or *sables*, because made of that animals tails. Lord Nottingham in a letter printed in Dalrymples Memoirs, Append. II. 79, giving an account of Queen Maries only visit to the play, says: "The choice of the play was the Spanish Friar, the only play forbid by the late king. Some unhappy expressions put the Queen in some disorder, and forced her to hold up her fan, and often look behind her, and call for her *palatine* and hood, and anything she could next think of, while those who were in the pit before her turned their heads over their shoulders, and all directed their looks towards her, whenever their fancy led them to make any application of what was said: as in one place, where the queen of Arragon is going to church in procession, 'tis said by a spectator: "Very good, she usurps the throne, keeps the old king in prison, and at the same time is praying for a blessing on her army." Furetiere in his Dictionary (1690) tells us that the fashion of wearing *palatines* had been recently introduced, "par une dame de la suite d' une princesse de la maison Palatine." This princess may not improbably have been Anne of Gonzaga, the wife to one of the sons of the unfortunate elector, Frederic V: for she spent the chief part of her life in France, and Bossuet pronounced a funeral oration over her in 1684. Or perhaps the *palatine* derived its name from the daughter of Count Löwestein, who was descended by a lefthanded marriage from the Palatine house: she came to Paris with the Dauphine as her maid of honour; Saint Simon describes her as "belle comme une ange, faite comme une nymphe, avec un esprit juste, et une vertu sans soupçons": she married M. de Dangeau, and became the first of the

dames du palais, and a great favorite with Madame de Maintenon.

In Farquhars Sir Harry Wildair (1701), I. 2, Mrs Parley says to her master: "I was running to Mademoiselle Furbelo, the French milliner, for a new *Burgundy* for my Lady's head. There's the prettiest fashion lately come over! so airy, so French, and all that! The pinners are double ruffled with twelve pleats of a side, and open all from the face: the hair is frizzled all up round the head, and stands as stiff as a bodkin. Then the favorites hang loose upon the temples, with a languishing lock in the middle. Then the caule is extremely wide, and over all is a coronet raised very high, and all the lappets behind." This *Burgundy* must no doubt have been so called in honour of the duchess of Burgundy, who excited so much admiration and regret, the wife of Louis the fourteenths grandson. Mirabel in the Inconstant (III. 2), says, alluding to the same headdress: "I had the oddest dream last night of the duchess of Burgundy: methought the fourbelows of her gown were pinn'd up so high behind, that I cou'd not see her head for her tail." In the Fops Dictionary a *bourgoigne* is explaind to be "the first part of the dress for the head near the hair:" this however must have been something quite different, and the name must have had a different origin: for the Duke of Burgundy did not marry till 1697.

Colbertine in the same Fops Dictionary is defined to be "a lace resembling network, of the fabrick of Monsieur *Colbert*, superintendent of the French Kings manufactures." In the "Satyr against the French," publisht in 1691, this is enumerated along with a variety of other things recently imported from the French:

> They taught our sparks to strut in *pantaloons*,
> And look as fiercely as the French dragoons:
> They made 'em cut off ornamental hair,
> A damn'd long *cherdreux periwig* to wear.
> No gloves but those of *Blois* will fit our hand,
> Our English kid we cannot understand:

Our homemade lace we do not think is fine,
We doat upon French *point* and *Colbertine*.
Nay we are grown so arrogantly vain,
Our stockings must be *mill'd*, our shoes *campaign*.
If at the court of France a tawdry whore
(Of quality I mean) has something wore,
Though never so ridiculously odd,
Her putting of it on creates a mode;
And by next post 'tis known at our Exchange.
Topknots were first invented by *Fontange:*
The ribband which is called the *Maintenon*,
Was by an old French mistress thought upon.

Evelyns assertion that Colbertine was despised is confirmed by Congreve, Way of the World, v. 1, where Lady Wishfort cries out to the maid she is turning away: "Go, drive a trade with your threepennyworth of small ware flaunting upon a packthread under a brandyseller's bulk, or against a dead wall by a ballad-monger. Go, hang out an old *Frisoneer-gorget*, with a yard of yellow *Colberteen*, an old gnaw'd mask, two rows of pins, and a child's fiddle, a glass necklace with the beads broken, and a quilted nightcap with one ear." Young indeed, in his fifth Satire, says of a woman who determines questions of great nicety:

Of silks and china she's the last appeal:
In these great points she leads the commonweal;
And if disputes of empire rise between
Mechlin, the queen of lace, and *Colberteen*,
'Tis doubt, 'tis darkness, till suspended fate
Assumes her nod to close the grand debate.

But it is no very grave imputation to suppose that he was not an adept in the phrases of millinery.

No doubt the Colbert above-mentiond was Louis the fourteenths great minister; who also bought the *Hotel des Gobelins* for the crown, and founded the royal manufactory of *Gobelin tapestry*. This name comes originally from Gobelin, a French dyer, in the time of Francis I, who made some improvements in the scarlet dye, and who, on discovering that the water

of the Bievre in the Fauxbourg S. Marceau was excellent for such purposes built a large dying house upon it. He is laught at by Rabelais (II. 22), who calls his building *la folie Gobelin*, the name it for a long time went by.

Among the Romans cloth of gold was called *cloth of Attalus.* The Pompeian portico, Propertius says, II. 23. 46, was hung with *Attalic tapestry.* Pliny (VIII. 71) after his usual fashion asserts that the art of embroidering cloth with gold was invented by Attalus: "Aurum intexere invenit Attalus rex: unde nomen *Attalicis.*" But we have already seen how prodigal he is of such patents. A more probable account of the name is suggested by Servius; who says, on Virgils Georgics, III. 23, that tapestry was called *aulæa* from the *aula* of king Attalus, where large curtains of it were for the first time found by the Romans, on their taking possession of the inheritance he bequeathed to them. Be this as it may, it is pretty clear that this was the reason the cloth obtaind the name of *Attalic.*

A *doily* too is supposed to be so called from the name of a person who manufactured a coarse sort of stuff often mentiond by the writers of queen Annes time. When winter comes, says Gay, Trivia, I. 43,

> Now in thy trunk thy *D'oily* habit fold,
> The silken drugget ill can fence the cold.

In a letter by "a man of mode" in the Spectator, No. 319, ridiculing some of the fashionable slang of the time, the writer says: "A few months since I brought up the modish jacket, or the coat with close sleeves. I struck this stroke at first in a plain *Doily:* but that failing I struck it a second time in blue camblet, and repeated the stroke in several kinds of cloth, until at last it took effect." Again in a dialogue in the Way of the World (1700), III. 10, characterized by Congreves usual sprightly wit, Millamant having said, "'Tis a lamentable thing that one has not the liberty of chusing ones acquaintance as one does ones clothes,"

Mrs Marwood replies, "If we had that liberty, we should be as weary of one set of acquaintance, tho' never so good, as we are of one suit, tho' never so fine. A fool and a *Doily* stuff would now and then find days of grace, and be worn for variety." Millamant rejoins—for Congreve always runs down a jest—"I could consent to wear 'em, if they wou'd wear alike: but fools never wear out. They are such *Drap-deberry* things. Without one could give 'em to ones chambermaid after a day or two." In like manner Lady Fanciful in Vanbrughs Provoked Wife, IV. 4, says: "I'm afraid that *Doily* stuff is not worn for want of better clothes." As to the name, though it may very probably have come from that of a great manufacturer, if there actually was one called *Doily*, it is by no means impossible that *doily* should originally have been a corruption of the French *toile*.

The *campaign shoes* spoken of in the extract given above from the "Satyr against the French" might be supposed to be merely shoes for the *campagne*. From Farquhars Love and a Bottle (1698), II. 2, it seems as if the *campaigne* had then been the fashionable wig. A pleasant dialogue is there carried on between Mockmode and Mrs Bullfinch. B. "Well, Sir, I hope you'll give us the beverage of your fine new cloaths." M. "Ay ay, Madam. But what's most modish for beverage. For I suppose the fashion of that alters always with the cloaths." B. "The tailors are the best judges of that—but Champaigne I suppose." M. "Is Champaigne a tailor? Now methinks that were a fitter name for a wigmaker. I think they call my wig *a campaigne*." B. "You're clear out, Sir, clear out. Champaigne is a fine liquor, which all your great beaux drink to make 'em witty." M. "Witty! Oh by the universe I must be witty. I'll drink nothing else: I never was witty in all my life. I love jokes dearly. Here, bring us a bottle of what d'ye call it: the witty liquor." The *campaigne wig* may perhaps have been the military wig: for this was an age when,

as we have seen already, military names were much in vogue. In Mrs Behns Aldermans Bargain (1687), II. 1, a *campaign* seems to be a soldiers coat: "you had good clothes when you came first, but they dwindled daily, till they dwindled to this old *campaign*, with tan-colour'd lining, once red." In the Fops Dictionary *campaine* is explaind to be "a kind of narrow picked lace:" this must be the French *campane*, the origin of which name appears from its description as having "petits ornemens *en forme de cloches*."

Pantaloons again came to us from France.

> The French we conquer'd once
> Now give us laws for *pantaloons*,
> The length of breeches, and the gathers,
> Port-cannons, perriwigs, and feathers:

says Butler, Hudibras, I. 3. 926. The characteristic of this dress formerly was that, as in the ancient hose, the breeches and stockings were all of one piece. Evelyn, in a tract entitled "Tyrannus or the Mode," recommending a dress that people should wear, says, "I would choose the loose riding-coat which is now the mode, and the hose which his Majesty often wears, or some fashion not so pinching as to need a shoeing-horn with the Dons, nor so exorbitant as the *pantaloons*, which are a kind of *hermaphrodite* and of neither sex: and if at any time I fancied them wider, or more open at the knees for the summer, it should be with a mediocrity, and not to set in plaits, as if I were supported with a pair of Ionic pillars, or the gatherings of my grannames loose gown." This passage illustrates and is illustrated by Wycherleys Gentleman Dancing-master (1673), where one of the characters is an affecter of Spanish, and another, his nephew, of French fashions, and where a great contest is carried on between Spanish hose and *pantaloons*. "Monsieur de Pantaloons (says the uncle), voto."—Mons. "Monsieur de *Pantaloons!* a pretty name, a pretty name, ma' foi! bien trouvé, de *Pantaloons*. Well! but have you not the admiration for

my *pantaloon*, Don Diego, mon oncle?"—Don. "I am astonish'd at them, verde deramente, they are wonderfully ridiculous."—Mons. "Ridicule! ridicule! ah—'tis well you are my uncle, da—Ridicule! ha—is dere any ting in de universe so jenti as de *pantaloons*?—any ting so raviaunt as de *pantaloons*?—Auh—I cou'd kneel down and varship a pair of jenti *pantaloons*. Vat, vat, you wou'd have me have de admiration for dis outward skin of your thigh, which you call Spanish hose? Fie, fie, fie—ha, ha, ha."—Don. "Dost thou deride my Spanish hose, young man? hauh!"—Mons. "In comparison of *pantaloon* I do undervalue 'em indeed, Don Diego, mon oncle, ha, ha, ha."—Don. "Thou art then a gavanho de malo gusto, look you."—Mons. "You may call me vat you vill, oncle Don Diego: but I must needs say your Spanish hose are scurvy hose, ugly hose, lousy hose, and stinking hose."—Don. "Do not provoke me, Boracho."—Mons. "Indeed, as for lousy, I recant dat epithete, for dere is scarce room in 'em for dat little animal, ha, ha, ha."—Don. "Do not provoke me, I say, en hora mala."—Mons. "Nay, oncle, I am sorry you are in de pation; but I must live and die for de *pantaloon* against de Spanish hose, da."—Don. "You are a rash young man; and while you wear *pantaloons*, you are beneath my passion, voto—auh—o—they make thee look and waddle, with all those gewgaw ribbons, like a great, old, fat, slovenly waterdog."—Mons. "And your Spanish hose, and your nose in the air, make you look like a great, grisled, long, Irish greyhound reaching a crust off from a high shelf; ha, ha, ha." From these descriptions it appears that the *pantaloons* which were in fashion a few years ago were of a completely different make: indeed it was only by a misnomer that they were so called: for they seem to have been copied from the dress of the *harlequin*, as the others were from that of the *pantaloon*, in the Italian pantomimes. In Phillips New World of Words (1696) *pantaloons* are already spoken of as "a sort of garment formerly worn." The

name of the *pantalone* is said by Menage to be derived from that of St *Pantaleon*, a saint in old times much worshipt by the Venetians, who called him *Pantalone*, "au lieu de *Pantaleone*, mot corrompu de *Pantelemone*, qui signifie tout misericordieux." Numbers of the Venetians, he adds, were christened Pantalone after their patron saint; and the name at length became a nickname for a Venetian, as the Bolognese in the Secchia Rapita are called *Petronii*, the Modenese *Geminiani*; or as *Paddy* is with us a name for an Irishman, *Taffy* for a Welshman. By others it has been conceived that *Pantaleone* is a corruption of *piantaleone*, and contains an allusion to the Venetian standard, the *lion* of St Mark. There may perhaps be evidence to settle this question; but it has never been produced: at all events it is likely enough that a supposed connexion with this *lion* should have aided in making the name so popular among the Venetians.

What was the origin of the name *berdash?* given, it would seem, to a kind of cravat, against which Steele in the tenth number of the Guardian says he had prepared a treatise. Half a dozen years before, in one of the Epilogues to Mrs Centlivres Platonick Lady (1706), the *bardash* had been enumerated along with false calves and favorites among the characteristics of the fops. Some have imagind that *berdash* is the theme of that perplexing word *haberdasher*, which has furnisht occasion for so many unlucky conjectures, and that a *haberdasher* was originally a dealer in *berdashes*. They forget that there is no evidence of *berdash* being a word of any antiquity: it is not to be found in Barrets Alvearie (1580), nor in Minshew (1617), nor in Sherwood (1650), nor in Torriano (1659), nor in Howel (1660), nor in Skinner (1671), nor in Phillips (1696). It is true the word may have been in existence, though everybody past it over: but at all events it can hardly have been in common use, and to this mass of negative evidence some positive evidence should be opposed. Yet neither Chambers, nor Todd who follows him, has referd

to any instance of its occurring, not even to the passage in the Guardian; and there is little chance of finding a much earlier one. Indeed the name of a fashionable article of dress is far more likely to be derived from some fine gentleman of the day, or from some accidental circumstance, than from an old obsolete word. The antiquity of the word *haberdasher* is proved by a *haberdasher* being one of Chaucers Canterbury Pilgrims; Sir Robert Billesdon, a *haberdasher*, was Mayor of London in 1484; the same office in 1426 was held by Sir John Rainewell, son of Robert Rainewell, citizen and *haberdasher;* and we find in Strypes Stow that "the *haberdashers* or *hurrers* (of old time so called) were incorporated a brotherhood of St Katharine in the 26th of Henry VI, A. D. 1447. There was also *Fraternitas S. Nicolai de Haberdasher.* The company was confirmed in the 17th of Henry VII, and named *merchant haberdashers.* They were also called *milleners*, from the place, Milain in Italy, whence the commodities they dealt in chiefly came: such were owches, brooches, agglets, spurs, caps, glasses. So that these tradesmen were such usually as sold wares that came from beyond the seas." Thus in Randolphs Muses Looking-glass Mrs Flowrdew is described as the "wife to a *haberdasher of small wares.*" With regard to the origin of *haberdasher* the most probable suggestion is Thomsons, in his Etymons of English words, that it comes from the German *habe*, goods, and *tauschen* or *vertauschen*, to exchange. Of the other derivations the most ingenious is that which resolves *haberdasher* into the four German words *hab er das her:* but as to its probability it is much of a piece with the resolution of *apothecary* into *a pot he carries.*"

To the name of wigs given above, pp. 38. 39, should be added a *Gregorian*, explained by Blount to be "a cap of hair, so called from one Gregory, a barber in the Strand, that first made them in England." Several passages illustrating this word are collected by Nares.

"What d'ye lack Ladies? (says the milliner in Shadwells Bury Fair, II. 2) fine *Mazarine* hoods, *fontanges*, girdles, sable-tippets, choice of fine gloves and ribbands."

When Gay wrote his Trivia, in 1720, the fashionable cloak was a *roquelaure*; the nature of which appears from his lines on it.

> Within the *roquelaure's* clasp thy hands are pent,
> Hands, that stretch'd forth invading harms prevent.
> Let the loop'd *bavaroy* the fop embrace,
> Or his deep cloak be spatter'd o'er with lace,
> That garment best the winter's rage defends,
> Whose shapeless form in ample plaits depends;
> By various names in various counties known,
> Yet held in all the true *surtout* alone. I. 51—58.

Noble (Biograph. Hist. III. 490) quotes a "Treatise upon the Modes, or a Farewell to the French Kicks," publisht in 1715, by Dr Harris, who is reported to have earnd a mitre by his reprobation of forein customs, and who says that "the French tailors invent new modes of dress, and dedicate them to great men, as authors do books: thus the *roquelaure* cloak, which displaced the *surtout*, was dedicated to the Duc de Roquelaure, whose title was spread by this means throughout France and Britain." In Sternes days it had long since fallen into disuse. "Trim, said my uncle Toby (VI. 6), I have a project in my head, as it is a bad night, of wrapping myself up warm in my *roquelaure*, and paying a visit to this poor gentleman.—Your Honour's *roquelaure*, replied the corporal, has not once been had on since the night before your Honour received your wound, when we mounted guard in the trenches before the gate of St Nicholas: and besides, it is so cold and rainy a night, that what with the *roquelaure*, and what with the weather, 'twill be enough to give your Honour your death." So "the eve which preceded the storm of the counterscarp, as my uncle Toby went to bed, he ordered his *Ramillies wig*, which had lain inside out for many years in the corner of an old campaigning trunk by his bedside, to be taken out and laid upon the lid of it ready

for the morning; and the very first thing he did in his shirt, when he had stept out of bed, my uncle Toby, after he had turned the rough side outwards, put it on." And again when he is going to woo the widow Wadman, Trim puts his "white *Ramillies* wig fresh into pipes." In both instances Sterne has introduced fashions which had become obsolete. The name *roquelaure* also made its way into Germany. In Tiecks beautiful story of *The Elves*, the sentinels are described as "uncouth figures, with mealy dusty faces, not unlike the ugly heads of white owls: they were wrapt up in folding cloaks of shaggy wool, and held umbrellas made of strange skins spread out over them; and they had bats wings, which jutted out grotesquely over their *roquelaures*, waving and fanning them incessantly." We also find *roquelaure* in the recent French dictionaries. Still it is not quite impossible that it may owe its origin to a mistake. *Roquet*, a word connected with the German *rock*, our *frock*, and Chaucers *rockette*, was formerly used in France to denote a short cloak, such as conjurors wear: a *roquet long* therefore would have been a natural name for a long cloak; and this, as the Duc de Roquelaure was a person of considerable notoriety, might without much difficulty be corrupted into *roquelaure*.

The *bavaroy* mentioned above seems to have been a Bavarian coat, probably imported by some of our officers who served under Marlborough in Germany.

In Ethereges Man of Mode (1676), iv. 2, Dorimant says to Sir Fopling Flutter, "You've a very fine *Brandenburg* on;" to which the fop replies: "It serves to wrap me up after the fatigue of a ball." This fashion had just come over from Paris: for Furetiere, describing the *Brandebourg*, says: "Grosse casaque qui est venue à la mode ces dernieres années. Elle va jusqu' a mi-jambe, et a des manches bien plus longues que les bras; et quand on y veut mettre quelque ornement, elle est chargée de boutons à queue d'espace en espace. Le nom passa en France en 1674, lorsque l'Electeur de

Brandebourg entra en Alsace. Les gens de l'Electeur portoient cette espece de casaque." In Wycherleys Plain-dealer (1678), II. 5, Olivia, on hearing of Manlys return, says: "Then shall I be pester'd again with his boisterous sea-love, have my alcove smell like a cabin, my chamber perfumed with his tarpaulin *brandenburg*, and hear vollies of brandy sighs, enough to make a fog in one's room."

In a note on the passage just quoted from Gay, he mentions, as among the "various names" of the *surtout*, a *joseph*, a *wrap-rascal*. The former of these names is plaid on by Pope in the Dunciad, II. 128:

> Curl stretches after Gay, but Gay is gone:
> He grasps an empty *Joseph* for a *John*.

Where Pope states that *Joseph Gay* was a fictitious name put by Curl before several pamphlets, which made them pass with many for Mr Gays: and Warburton adds: "the ambiguity of the word *joseph*, which likewise signifies a loose upper-coat, gives much pleasantry to the idea." These passages shew that the name is of some standing; and Popes lines suggest that it arose originally out of the story of Joseph leaving his garment in the hands of Potiphars wife. There is a couplet in Youngs fourth satire however which might lead one to suspect that the allusion was to the coat of many colours: where he says of the fool out of fashion,

> How his eyes languish, how his thoughts adore
> That *painted coat* which *Joseph* never wore.

The term *benjamin* for a great coat seems to be more recent, but might spring naturally enough out of the foregoing word.

"To Mademoiselle Pantine (says Noble, III. 491), a mistress of Marshal Saxe, the world was obliged for that stiffened pasteboard case, called a *pantine*, by which a universal compression ensued, to the destruction of the symmetry of the female form."

The frequency of such names has induced Gay, the habits of whose early life fixt his attention on such matters, to enliven his Trivia with a fable how Vulcan

fell in love with Patty, the pride of the village, and how "to save her steps from rains and piercing dews,

> in his heavenly thought
> A new machine mechanick fancy wrought;
> Above the mire her shelter'd steps to raise,
> And bear her safely through the wintry ways.
> Strait the new engine on his anvil glows,
> And the pale virgin on the patten rose.
> No more her lungs are shook with dropping rheums,
> And on her cheeks reviving beauty blooms.
> Hence *pattens* now support each frugal dame,
> Which from the blue-ey'd *Patty* take their name.

In our own days we have seen the loose trowsers which were introduced by the Duke of Wellington into our army in Spain, designated by his name: and though they have let it slip from them, the half-boots which were devised to match them, are termed *wellingtons* without any adjunct. A shorter sort of boots are called *Blucher boots:* the name of one of the heroes of Waterloo suggested that of the other.

Indeed hardly a month passes without some new name of the same sort being invented by the fashion-setters at Paris, which soon after comes over into England. The Belle Assemblee would supply an abundant crop of such; and many of them have at least a kind of interest as denoting the favorite of the day. Thus one is told of *Sonntag collars*, and *chemisettes à la Leontine*, the former named after the celebrated singer, the latter after the popular actress Leontine Fay. *Byron collars* attest the admiration of the French for our poet: and *Marino Faliero sleeves* must have come in when Delavignes imitation of Byrons tragedy was the delight of the Parisian playgoers.

At the beginning of the Revolution, when wigs and pigtails were done away, along with all the other relics of elder times, and when there was a great passion to be classical, the fashionable crop-heads were copied from some of the Roman busts, and designated by the name of the original. One way of dressing the hair was *à le*

Brutus, another, cut closer, *à le Titus*. The latter name at least made its way into Germany: a footman in Tiecks *Liebeszauber* is described as a "naseweiser Bursche mit einem *Tituskopf*."

A carriage too may sometimes derive its name from a man of fashion. A particular sort of gig is termed a *stanhope*, from having first been brought into vogue by one of Lord Harringtons brothers.

A like cause must have been the origin of the name, *a davenport*, given to a sort of small writing-table for ladies, with a desk and drawers.

A *tilbury* on the other hand is so called after Tilbury, the livery-stable-keeper, and probably was invented by him.

A couple of perfumers who lived in former times have been spoken of above, pp. 40—42. The *Neroli* gloves made their way into England in Charles the Seconds time. "O they cry out upon perfumes (says Belinda in Sir Fopling Flutter (1676), v. 1), that they are unwholsome; one of 'em was falling into a fit with the smell of these *Narolii*." So too in Shadwells Virtuoso (1676), at the end of the third act, when Sir Samuel Harty comes on in disguise, he says he has "choice good gloves, amber, orangery, Genoa Romane, *Frangipand*, *Neroly*, tuberose, jessamine, and *Martial*,—the best *Peter* and Spanish paper that ever came over."

The same class of persons are still sedulous in attaching their names to their compositions. We use *Rigges soap*, and *Smiths lavender water:* and on all the walls in England we read the praises of *Hunts blacking*, and *Warrens blacking*, and it is hard to say how many other persons blacking.

The three kings whose relics pilgrims used to visit at Cologne, have now been superseded by three wonders that every traveller must go to see: and these, as all the streetboys din in his ears the moment he lands from the steamboat, are the Dome, Rubenses Martyrdom of

St Peter, and the real *Jean Marie Farinas manufactory of Cologne Water.* Many too, no doubt, think the last the most interesting sight of the three.

Hungary water in France is *Eau de la Reine d'Hongrie*, of which our name is only a curtaild form: for in the Mundus Muliebris Evelyn, enumerating the "store of waters" requisite in the dressing-room, says: "Nor may *Hungarian Queen's* be wanting." The earliest book in which Beckmann (Hist. of Inv. II. 104), says he has found the receit, is the Selectiora Remedia, Francof. 1659, by Joannes Prævotius. This writer relates that he met with it in the beginning of an old breviary, along with the following words: "I, Elizabeth, queen of Hungary, being very infirm and much troubled with the gout in my 72d year, used for a year this receit given me by an aged hermit, whom I never saw before or since; and was not only cured, but recoverd my strength, and appeard to all so remarkably beautiful, that the king of Poland askt me in marriage. I refused him however for the love of my Lord Jesus Christ, from one of whose angels I believe I received the remedy." This story, when stript of its marvellous features, and reduced to its substance, is probable enough: that is, hermits being skilled in simples, a queen of Hungary may have been led by one to use some extract of rosemary, and may have receivd benefit from doing so. At all events there is nothing on the face of the tale to justify Beckmanns conjecture that it was originally nothing more than a puff, and that the name *eau de la reine d'Hongrie* was merely chosen for the sake of giving celebrity to the water, just as various medicines in later times were advertised by the name of *Pompadour*, though Madame de Pompadour had never used or seen them. The story of the extraordinary cure, but without mention of the hermit, is also found in Le Febvres Traicté de la Chymie, I. 437, which was publisht at Paris in 1660, so that he can hardly have derived it from Prævotiuses book. The popularity of *Hungary water* in England shortly after

WORDS CORRUPTED BY FALSE ANALOGY OR FALSE DERIVATION.

WORDS of several syllables are usually either deduced from shorter words according to certain obvious analogies, or compounded of several significant words; and we are impelled by a strong and general propensity to construct words according to these methods, and to suppose that the words we hear are so constructed. This tendency indeed appears necessary to the existence of a distinct and settled language. But often the analogies which have operated in the formation of a word are far from obvious and clear. It may have received its form by the influence of several obscure changes, depending upon the various languages, times, and accidents, through which it has come to us; or it may resemble some numerous or obvious class, to which it does not truly belong. In such cases it is very common and natural for the spelling or formation of the word to be modified by a mistaken view of its analogy. In many English words this misformation is now so firmly established, that it would be idle to wish we should retrace our steps; and a notice of the perversion can only serve to illustrate the history of the language. In cases where use still wavers, it seems desirable that the true analogy should settle the spelling or construction.

In like manner a word of considerable length, which does not shew in its initial or final syllable, or in its form, that it is regularly obtained from some known root, is generally assumed to be a compound word: and we feel uneasy and dissatisfied till we have invested at least a part of it with meaning. If we can manage that this meaning shall have a reference to the signification of the word, or to anything which may supposably relate to its history and associations, so much the better; and the word is modified so as to favour this impression. But rather than go on using a long word composed of altogether unmeaning elements, there is scarcely any notion which can be fastened upon the separate syllables, however incongruous or improbable, that we do not at times adopt; apparently with a hope that it may turn out to be connected, by some chance or chain, with the introduction or signification of the word.

Mispellings arising from false Analogy.

Connexion (*connexio*, from *connexus*), *reflexion*, *inflexion*, are often spelt with *ct*, after the manner of *collection* (*collectio*, from *collectus*), and the numerous other words of the same sort; this mistake being also favoured by the termination of the verbs *connect*, *reflect*, *inflect*. Yet we do not write *pervertion*, *invertion*, from *pervert*, *invert*; nor has the corruption extended to *complexion*, *fluxion*, *defluxion*; perhaps because *complex*, *flux*, *influx*, are familiar words, while we have no such verb as *complect* in modern English, or as *fluct* or *defluct*. The only reasonable rule seems to be, to retain in such abstract terms the form of the Latin supine and verbal noun. For though many, perhaps most, of our verbs of Latin origin are derived

from the supine, there is a number of exceptions; and in the greater part of these it would be impossible to form verbals by adding *ion* to our own verbs. In dealing with our Latin forms we must be regulated, as far as possible, by the practice of the Romans.

This principle has rightly led us to reject the form *Defendour* of the Faith, as Henry VIII is styled in the title-page to Lord Berners Froissart. *Defensour* might have kept its ground: when such words come from the Latin or French, they are properly made to end in *our*, or, as the practice now is with regard to personal appellatives, in *or*. But when a noun of this sort is derived immediately from the English verb, its legitimate termination is *er*. *Practisour*, used by Chaucer C. T. 424, is liable to the same objection as *defendour*.

Offense (*offensio*), *defense*, *expense*, *recompense*, *suspense*, *pretense*, are usually written with a *c*, from an erroneous analogy to the words like *patience*, in which the Latin *entia* becomes *ence*. The French with better judgement have preserved the distinction. So do some of our own writers: Holinshed writes *offense*, *defense*; and we all retain the *s* in the adjectives *offensive*, *defensive*, *defensible*, *indefensible*; so do we in *expanse*: beside which these words are derived from verbs in *end*, while the other class come from adjectives in *ent*. So strong however is the influence of this false analogy, that in our old writers we also meet often with *dispence*, *immence*, and even with *sence* (Spenser F. Q. I. 1. 18); and in the seventeenth century, when that compound was introduced, with *nonsence*: Habington for instance writes so uniformly: but in these instances the corruption has passed away. With regard to *licence* usage has always been fluctuating; probably because the government, which has borne its share in corrupting the language, has granted *licenses*: for there can be no doubt that the derivative from *licentia* ought to be *licence*. Yet it might be well to retain *license* for the verb and its derivatives, as

Milton writes throughout his Speech for the Liberty of *unlicensed* Printing: this would be justified by the analogy of *advice, advise,* and the numerous instances where the flat sibilant in the verb answers to the sharp one in the noun.

The similarity of its sound to the same class of words in *nce* transformed *ones,* the old adverbial genitive of *one,* into *once. Ones* is the form used by Chaucer, C. T. 767. 1036. 1838. 2390. So is *thries* for *thrice:* C. T. 63. 465. 578: and *twies* for *twice:* the Hoste says to the Coke, C. T. 4345:

> Many a Jacke of Dover hast thou sold
> That hath been *twies* hot and *twies* cold.

Decrepit (*decrepitus,* one that has ceased to sound) is often spelt *decrepid,* after the analogy of *pallid, languid, limpid:* for most of our adjectives from the Latin in *itus* end in *ite,* like *infinite,* because the penultime of the original is long.

Presumptuous, it would seem, ought to be *presumptious,* as being much more nearly connected with *presumption* than with *sumptuous.* Yet even in Sidonius Apollinaris, the oldest writer that uses the Latin original, the manuscripts vary between *præsumptiosus* and *præsumptuosus;* and that the latter gained the field from its rival is proved by the French *presomptueux,* and the Italian *prosuntuoso;* where in consequence of the anomalous termination the derivation from *presumere* has been lost sight of. Indeed it was probably the connexion with *sumptuosus* that gave birth to an adjective so little sanctioned by analogy.

Accessory, from *accessorius,* has been corrupted into *accessary,* from its likeness to *necessary:* Blackstone however preserves the right form.

Refractary on the other hand, from *refractarius,* has become *refractory,* following in the train of such adjectives as *laudatory.*

The same reason, strengthened by the frequent occurrence of *repository,* led to the modern corruption

which uses *depository* of persons, instead of *depositary*. Those who try to be accurate sometimes reverse this errour by using *depositary* of places.

Separate is so often mispelt *seperate*, that one is tempted to look round for a reason why it should be so: and the number of similar instances justifies us in assuming that the mistake is owing to a blundering association with *desperate*, *temperate*.

The *t* in *parchment* (*parchemin*, charta *pergamena*) seems to come from the large class of words in which *ment* answers to the Latin *mentum*.

A somewhat similar analogy subjoined the same letter to the old form *margent* for *margin*.

Parallelopiped, says Johnson, comes from the French *parallelopipede:* in the Dictionary of the Academy however the word is rightly spelt *parallelepipede*, from παραλληλεπίπεδον. Simson too writes it correctly: the corruption, with whomever it originated, arose from the writer's not knowing the meaning of the word, and assimilating it too closely to *parallelogram*.

Scent used to be rightly spelt *sent*, from *sentio:*

> No Northwinde shall the corne infest,
> But the soft spirit of the East
> Our *sent* with perfumed banquets feast,

says Habington: Bacon uniformly writes *sent:* the *c* seems to have been borrowed from *ascent*, *descent*.

What prevented *inveigh* (*invehor*) from following the analogy of *convey* (*conveho*)? Was it corrupted from its resemblance to *weigh*? or to *inveigle*? In some old books one also finds *surveigh* (*surveoir*, *supervidere*): but the guttural *gh* has no business in any word of Latin origin. In our Saxon words it is well to retain it, though mute, as a mark of their parentage. This of itself ought to warn us against the common notion, supported even by Horne Tooke, whose etymological acuteness in this instance was blunted by his metaphysical perversity, that *right* comes from *rectus:* though in all probability the two words are

remotely connected. The form of the adjective *righteous* indeed would seem to favour the vulgar opinion: for the termination *ous*, which answers to the Latin *osus*, the French *eux*, could hardly be appended to a Teutonic word except through some confusion. And such turns out to be the case: not only is there no word in Latin or French from which *righteous* could analogically be derived, but "in our old Saxon English (as Owen Feltham says, Resolves II. 48.) *righteous* was *rightwise*, and *righteousnesse* was originally *rightwisenesse*." *Rightwisnesse* or *rightwysnesse* is of frequent occurrence in Wickliff's Version. In Rolle's Psalter, translated in the early part of the 14th century, we find *rightwise*. *Rihtwis* is a common word in Anglosaxon; and from it come *rihtwise* justice, *rihtwisnesse*, *rihtwisian* to act justly, and *gerihtwisian* to justify.

The guttural *gh* however has intruded into *spright*, from *spirit*; which, having been contracted into *sprite*, was assimilated to *sight*, *night*, &c. In Spenser we find the change going on: he uses the two forms indiscriminately; *sprite* F. Q. I. 40. 43, *spright* I. 38. 45. From this last stanza it appears that such transformations were promoted by the tendency to spell words alike which were used as rimes. This reason in II. 9. 43 leads him to write *case* with a *c* like *face*, *grace*, *embrace*, the words it rimes with. Many similar instances are to be found in our old poets. Indeed Puttenham expressly recognizes the principle. "It is somewhat more tollerable (he says) to help the rime by false orthographie, than to leave an unplesant dissonance to the eare by keeping trewe orthographie and loosing the rime; as for example it is better to rime *dore* with *restore*, than in his truer orthographie, which is *doore*. Arte of English Poesie, II. 8.

Delight too comes from *delecto*, and in Chaucer is *delit*, C. T. 337. 339. 7457, or *delite*, C. T. 1681. But the resemblance to *light* was too tempting to be resisted. It is a noticeable instance of the working of an

unconscious analogical tact, that, while *delite* was in use, the adjective formed from it was *delitable*, (C. T. 7938. 8075) with the Latin termination: but nobody would think of writing *delightable:* the verb and substantive having assumed a Teutonic form, the adjective becomes *delightful* or *delightsome.*

Spenser, Habington, and others, also wrote *spight* for *spite:* but this has not become prevalent. Nor has *quight*, which is used in the Faerie Queene 1. 1. 45. 53.

The influence of the same class of words in *ight* seems to have drawn *height* away from the analogy of the corresponding terms, *length*, *breadth*, *width*, *depth*, *strength*, *dearth*, *youth* (formerly *yongth*). Milton however constantly wrote *highth*, P. L. 1. 24. 92. 282. 552. 723; and when the word is used in its abstract sense, it would be well to follow his example; while, to keep poets from grumbling at the loss of so convenient a rime, they might still be allowed to say *hight* for a hill. The insertion of the *e* occasions a needless anomaly: for though the vowel is changed in most of the other cases, the change is not of the same kind. In the A. S. the adjective appeared under a variety of forms; *heag*, *heah*, *heg*, *heh*, *hig*, *hih*; each pair of which had its corresponding substantive *heahtho*, *hehthe*, *hihth.* In Robert of Gloucester the adjective is *heye*, and then the substantive would naturally have been *heyth* or *heith.* Chaucer has *heigh*, C. T. 1800, *heye*, C. T. 2077; but usually he writes *high* or *highe*, and *hight*, C. T. 1892. Spenser too writes *hight;* and since we have entirely got rid of the *e* in the one form, there is no conceivable reason for keeping it in the other; more especially as it is mute, which in *neighbour* is not the case: for here too, though we rejected the old form *neh*, (which Chaucer writes *neigh*, C. T. 2344, *neighe*, v. 590. 734. 1491, *neye*, v. 1332), we retained the *e* in the derivative.

Drought too violates the analogy of the class of nouns to which it properly belongs; and the difference of

its vowel sound from that of *dry* obscures the connexion between them. Tindall and others wrote *drith*: but that, not to mention that the vowel in it would naturally be short, was too remote from *drought* to become current in its stead: and *droughth* has a ponderous accumulation of useless letters. But why should not we write *drouth* as Spenser did, and Hall, and Bacon, Naturall History, §. 669, where the recent editors have injudiciously substituted *drought*? Indeed in speech we commonly hear an attempt to pronounce the word as if it had an *h* at the end.

Strait in the sense of narrow—*etroit*, *stretto*, *strictus*—is not unfrequently written *straight*; for instance, by Bacon, Naturall History, §. 28: but this arises from confounding it with a completely distinct word, *straight*, opposed to crooked; which belongs to the same family with *stretch*, and is an intensive of *right*, as *stretch* is of *reach*. This mistake too is sometimes reversed: Chaucer, C. T. 954, uses *strete*, and v. 1692 *streite*, for *straight*. In Paradise Lost II. 948:

> "So eagerly the Fiend
> O'er bog, or steep, through *strait*, rough, dense, or rare,
> With head, hands, wings, or feet, pursues his way:"

Milton ought rather to have used *straight*: for in other passages he preserves the distinction between the two words, using *straight* properly, I. 531. 723. II. 959, *straiten* I. 776.

A like confusion has caused *sleight*, a good old word which we hardly retain except in the phrase *sleight of hand*, to be usually miswritten *slight*. The two words are indeed remotely connected, but branched off very long ago.

Was it the resemblance to *before*, or a supposed connexion with the common prefix *fore*, that led us in *wherefore* and *therefore* to subjoin an *e*? which prevents our distinguishing at first glance that the last syllable is nothing more than *for*.

It is from *some* that *handsome*, *toilsome*, *lonesome* derived their final *e*. Spenser wrote *darksom*, *lothsom*, F. Q.

1. 1. 14; Milton *noisòm*, Arcad. 49, *bucksom*, Allegr. 24, *gamesom*, Com. 173, *troublesom*, Preface on the Verse of P. L; and it would have been better to follow their example: for the *e* has led to a general misconception of these adjectives, which etymologers say are compounded with *some*, and imply a certain degree, *somewhat*, of the quality they denote. The termination *some* or *som* is the A. S. *sum*, the German *sam*, and belongs proximately to the root *seem*; thus corresponding exactly with our other termination *ly*, which is *like*, *lich*, *gleich*. No doubt however the two *somes* are remotely connected, as are *simul* and *similis*, ἅμα ὁμοῦ and ὅμοιος, which all belong to the same family.

Nor does there appear to have been any valid reason for doubling the final consonant in the large class of adjectives that end in *less*. By our older writers they were often written with a single *s*: Chaucer has *detteles*, C. T. 584, *gilteles*, C. T. 1314. 1316: Sir Thomas Malory writes *wyveles*, Morte d'Arthur 1. 2, *swerdles* 1. 5: even Milton wrote *thankles*, Lycidas 66, *haples*, 164, *pathles*, Penser. 70, *harmles*, Com. 166; though these words have been modernized in the recent editions. In the adjectives compounded with *full*, *fearful*, *beautiful*, we omit one of the *l*s belonging to the theme: no greater stress is laid on the final syllable in the one class than in the other: and though the single final *s* has generally the flat sound, the exceptions to this practice are so numerous—this very word *numerous* is an instance of a large body of them—that there need be no scruple about augmenting them. In this case again etymologers have been misled by the resemblance into supposing that the termination *less* is the same with the adjective *less*, which is only an independent derivative from the same theme. Not however that Horne Tooke was right in asserting (D. of P. 1. 167) that this termination is *les*, the imperative of the A. S. verb *lesan*, to dismiss; and that *hopeless* meant *dismiss hope*,

restless dismiss rest, deathless dismiss death. This is not the way in which words are usually formed: but here, as in many other cases, he was deluded by his ingenuity; and having hit on a principle which he applied with success in a variety of instances, he could not withstand the temptation of straining it far beyond what it would bear. No doubt Tyrwhitt, whom he reprehends, came nearer the truth, in tracing the termination *less* to the adjective *loose*. *Leas* in A. S. means *free from, destitute of: leohtes leas, destitute of light*, has little more than to coalesce to form *lightless: sceom-leas* is *shameless:* so *godless* is properly *without god in the world.* Thus this termination—which is only a different form of the German *los*, has exactly the same signification, and is appended in a number of instances to the same words,—is the direct opposite to our other termination *ful:* though here too opposites may sometimes meet; *shameless* for instance and *shameful* are not far removed from each other.

The last syllable of *random* looks at first sight like the same termination which we find in *freedom, wisdom:* but there is not the slightest analogy of meaning; nor have we any word from which we could so derive it. It was however owing to this erroneous association that the final consonant was changed. In the Morte d'Arthur, I. 10, "Ulfyus and Brastias dressid their sperys, and ranne to gyder with grete *raundon.*" In Barbour and Gavin Douglas, quoted by Jamieson, it is *randoun*, and applied to very rapid motion. In Spenser too it is *randon*, in the expression *at randon*, Sheph. Cal. May 46, F. Q. II. 4. 7: Sackville, Ferr. and Por. I. 2, has the verb to *randon*, which also existed in old Scotch, as did *randonner* and *randon* in old French. The word however seems to be of Teutonic origin, and to be derived from *rennan dun* to *run down.*

A like erroneous analogy seems to have acted upon *seldom.* Chaucer wrote *selden*, C. T. 8022. 10125: the A. S. form is *seldan*, or *seldon;* the German *selten*,

In *ransom* too from *rançon* the final *n* has become *m*: but here again there was a large class of words similar in sound. For otherwise we rather make the converse change: *nom* became *noun*, and *renowme*, *renoume*, or *renome* (*renommee*), as the word is written in the Morte d'Arthur, by Lord Berners, and by Holinshed, has been transformed into *renown*. In Spenser, F. Q. I. 5. 43, the first edition has *renouned* by a misprint, which is corrected among the errata into *renowmed*. Probably the other form was coming into use: the printer according to custom took upon him to mend his authors spelling; but Spensers love of archaisms rejected the improvement.

Chaucer says of his *Persone*, "His *parishens* devoutly wolde he teche: C. T. 484." This form, or, as it would now be, *parishian*, answers much better than our modern *parishioner* to the French *paroissien*, and seems to have been lengthened from a false analogy to such words as *commissioner*. The latter comes from *commission*, as *probationer* does from *probation*, the personal termination being *er*, not *ioner*: but a *parish* was never called a *parishion*.

Practitioner, instead of *practiser*, from *practise*, is in like manner anomalously elongated. Chaucer says of his Doctour of Phisike, C. T. 424: "He was a veray parfite *practisour*."

A *scrivener* too has acquired a superfluous termination. Chaucers word is *scriven*, Troil. II. 1026; and this was the right way of rendering the French *ecrivain*.

Warriour again, or *warrior*, is an anomalous form, liable to the objection before made to *defendour*. Milton wrote *warrier*, P. L. I. 316. 565; though here, as in a number of other instances, his text has been corrupted by his editors. *Warrier* or *warrayer* would have been a more analogous way of writing a word which must have come from the verb, to *warray*, used by Spenser F. Q. I. 5. 48. II. 10. 50. 72, or *warrey*, as it is spelt in F. Q. II. 10. 21. III. 5. 48. In Chaucer it is *werreie* or *werreye*; C. T. 1546. 10324. 14338.

In speech few blunders are commoner than the confounding *prebend* and *prebendary;* and the same blunder has found its was into books, even those of our better authors. Indeed it is difficult to avoid being misled by the analogy of *dean deanery*, *canon canonry*, to suppose that the *prebend* must be the person who holds the *prebendary*, instead of the *prebendary* holding the *prebend.* The origin of the latter term is well explained by Ducange: *præbenda* was the appropriate term for the daily allowance of provisions made to the monks, or to the regulars, the *canonici*, as it had been used for the ration of a Roman soldier: and in process of time, when the ecclesiastical revenues increased so that the chapters had a surplus to divide among their members, the same name was given to the dividend received by each.

Tongue in Chaucer is *tonge*, C. T. 267. 1440; in Lord Berners, and Spenser F. Q. Intr. 2, *tonge;* in Holinshed *toong;* and seems to have derived its final mutes from *langue.* Coming from the A. S. *tung*, it has no manner of right to them; and they certainly give it a French look. In *catalogue* on the other hand, by Holinshed written *catalog*, in *prologue*, which with Lord Berners is *prologe*, and the like, the concluding vowels are perhaps better retained.

U however, which with the French often serves to harden the soft *g* before *e* and *i*, is sometimes needlessly inserted in words we have derived from them; in *guard*, which our old writers spelt *gard*, from *garder*, in *guarantee* from *garantir;* and no less needlessly in some of our Saxon words, *guess*, *guest*, *guild*, *guilt.* Chaucer wrote *gesse*, C. T. 82. 1052. 1104. 10124, *gest*, 8214. 8215, *gilt*, *gilty*, and *gilteles*, 1767. 662. 1316; Holinshed *gess:* and as our practice is to pronounce the *g* hard in our Saxon words, *get*, *give*, *gird*, nothing has been gained by the alteration. Nor has there by the introduction of the *h* into *ghost*, *ghastly*, *aghast:* Chaucer writes *gost*, C. T. 205, *gastly* C. T. 1986; Milton *agast*, Hymn on the Nativity 160,

Paraphr. of the 114th Psalm 15. In Holinshed we find *ghest*, in Sylvester and even in Dryden *ghess*; which shews what capriciousness prevailed in such things.

Before *g* on the other hand we are very fond of inserting an *n*. The *nightingale* is in A. S. *nihtegale*, in Germ. *nachtigall*, the bird that *gales* or cries by *night*. Thus we write *passenger* for *passager*, *messenger* for *messager*, as it stands in the Morte d'Arthur I. 1. 8. 10. 18; *harbinger* for the German *herberger*, from the A. S. *herebeorgan*, to *harbour*. So the *Portuguese* in our old writers are perpetually called the *Portingales*.

Very often mispellings are introduced into words of forein origin, with which we have not grown quite familiar, from a wish apparently to make them look as unenglish as possible.

Thus *profane* in our older writers is generally *prophane*; either after the analogy of *prophet*, or because they knew that the combination *ph* belonged to one of the southern languages, it mattered not which. *Gulf* in like manner is often spelt *gulph*; though it came to us through the French *golfe* from the Italian *golfo*; nor is there a φ in the Greek theme, κόλπος. So in the Mirrour for Magistrates, I. 1. 31. 33, we find *Aphrica*, substituted as a correction in the edition of 1587 for *Affrica*, the reading of the edition of 1575. The *Bosporus* too, as it is rightly spelt by Milton, P. L. II. 1018, is usually changed into the *Bosphorus*. In words which we assimilated by familiar usage, the Greek φ became *f*: in others *ph*, as in Latin. *Vial*, which is commoner than *phial*, from *phiala*, φιάλη, is an exception: was this owing to its resemblance to *violet*?

In *hypothenuse*, as it is mostly written, for *hypotenuse*, ὑποτείνουσα, an *h* has in like manner been interpolated; perhaps from its resemblance to *hypothesis*.

In like manner *amarant* (ἀμάραντον), as it is written by Milton P. L. 352. 353, has usually an *h* tackt on at the end. Johnson in quoting this very passage of Milton has silently altered the spelling. This

h however got likewise into the Latin: *amarantus* indeed has the best authority in its favour, but *amaranthus* is also found in old inscriptions. Milton himself in the Lycidas, 150, wrote: "bid *amaranthus* all his beauty shed." And though the French, not being able to pronounce the *th*, write *amarante*, and the Italians *amaranto* and *amarantino*, yet the analogy of *hyacinth* and *hyacinthine* has prevailed over that of *adamant* and *adamantine*, to establish *amaranth* and *amaranthine*. For such analogies always exercise great influence, where there is a similarity of meaning as well as sound. Buttmann has remarked, in Heindorfs Plato II. 523, the singular correspondence between the anomalies in the infinitives διψῆν and πεινῆν, in the futures ἕδομαι and πίομαι, in the diphthong ευ taken into the futures ῥέυσω, χέυσω, νέυσω. The same unconscious feeling of analogy led a child who had been scolded for asking for *tatoes*, and told always to say *potatoes*, to cry out a few days after at dinner: "pray mama will you give me some *poturnips*."

No letter however has had such tricks plaid with it as *y*. It is introduced into proper names, such as *Smyth*, *Taylor*, to distinguish them from the appellatives they are derived from; *Dryden* for altering his family name fell into disfavour with his cousin Sir R. *Driden:* and in forein words *y* is perpetually thrust in where it ought not to appear, and often left out where it ought: sometimes both these things happen in the same word. A *sibyl* is very often spelt a *sybil: sirens* become *syrens: cipher* (*chiffre*) is mostly written with a *y:* so is *tiro:* even in Paradise Lost (I. 355) we find "the *Lybian* sands," though in the Hymn on the Nativity Milton wrote correctly, "the *Libyc* Hammon;" so that the mistake was probably owing to the scribe or printer; for though Milton evidently gave specific directions about the spelling of many words in Paradise Lost, in far the greater part of them this could not possibly be the case; and *Lybian* was so natural a mistake, that Holinshed, whose

orthography is mostly commendable, and Randolph have *Lybia*, deceived probably by the resemblance of *Lycia* and *Lydia*. Coleridge in his book on the Church and State writes *synonime* over and over again: and a *tiger* has been unaccountably turned into a *tyger* by a number, if not the majority, of our authors, from Spenser down to Reginald Heber. And yet the general principle by which the usage of *y* in modern English should be regulated, is tolerably distinct. With the exception of a few peculiar cases, it ought never to be inserted in the middle of a word, save where it answers to the Greek *υ*. For this purpose was the character first invented a little before the time of Cicero by the Romans; among whom no doubt it had a sound corresponding to that of the letter it stood for. In the same manner was it used by Ulphilas, to represent the Greek *υ*: for there was no such letter in the Gothic or old German alphabets. In the Anglosaxon on the contrary, and the old northern dialects, *y* is very common, and seems to have had the sound of the close or French *u*, being often a substitute for the broad *u*, as in *cyning* for *cuning*, *king*, *fyll* for *full*, *fyrs* for *furze*, *dynjan* for to *thunder*, *wyrt* for *wurze*, *wort*. In later ages of our language the *y* lost all its peculiar sound, and became a mere superfluous counterpart of *i* or *j*: at one time it was very much in fashion: every page in the Morte d'Arthur, and of Lord Berners, is thickly sown with it; we there find *wyll*, *dyd*, *tydynges*, *fyghtyng*, *theyr*, *hyll*, and so on without end. Many like spellings still linger in the text of Spenser: but Holinshed seems to have had a design of exterminating them, and is even more sparing of *y*s than we now are. We are ready to admit them at the close of a word, apparently because the letter stands so near the tail of the alphabet, or because, having a tail of its own, it enables one to end with a flourish; and in that place we set *y* for the short *i*, especially

in the termination *ly*, or for *e*, as in *city*, *prosperity*, which so late as in the time of Henry VIII used to be written *cite*, *prosperite*, till the frequency of the mute final *e* made it advisable to put some other character for it whenever it was to be pronounced. This analogy would lead us to write *simily*, that *simile* may not be pronounced like *smile;* as Milton in the Lines at a Solemn Musick wrote *jubily*, which perhaps would have been a better substitute for *jubile*, than the form we have since adopted, *jubilee*. Holinshed on the other hand wrote *whie*, *manie*, *citie*, *daie*, *gaie*, *everie*, *suddenlie*, *godlie*, and so on. The cases where *y* is admissible in the middle of a word not of Greek origin, are chiefly, where it is a consonant, as in *beyond*, *lawyer;* where it prevents the meeting of two *i*s, as in *dying*, *lying*, for which same reason Holinshed wrote *lieng*, *flieng*, *saieng*, *carrieng;* or where it is the last letter of a diphthong as in *voyage*, *joyous*, *conveyance*. Perhaps however this last head would most properly be restricted to cases where *y* is followed by a vowel: the analogy of *raiment*, *daily*, *gaily*, would lead us to write *enjoiment*, *emploiment;* the analogy of *beautiful*, to write *joiful;* the analogy of *said*, *afraid*, *paid*, *overlaid*, *slain*, to write *plaid*, *staid*, *delaid* as Milton writes P. L. II. 938, Com. 494; *arraid*, as Spenser and Tusser write. *Handiwork* and *handicraft* are only written *handywork* and *handycraft* from a blunder which confounds the *i* of the old genitive with the *y* of the adjective: and Holinshed is a sufficient authority to establish the propriety of *countriman*, Browne that of *ferriman;* while *holiday* and *demigod* are mostly spelt with an *i*. In plurals the final *y* usually becomes *ie*, as in *cities;* except where this would occasion a triphthong, as in *days*, *ways:* in the plural of *valley*, *journey*, the best authorities seem to be in favour of eliding the first *e*, and writing *vallies*, *journies*. In like manner Milton writes *honied*, Lycidas 140: and though Coleridge, with an inconsistency unusual in these days,

has *monied* in the text of his book on the Church and State, p. 99, and *moneyed* in the note which refers to it, those who are more curious about such niceties will adopt the former, and reject the latter.

Sometimes *h* was introduced even into our Saxon words. Our good old word *fere*, a companion or mate, from the A. S. *fera* or *gefera*, the same as the German *gefährte*, though used by Chaucer Troil. iv. 791—"As Orpheus and Eurydice his *fere*"—by Spenser F. Q. i. 10. 4, and in Titus Andronicus iv. 1, was spelt with *ph* by those who, not distinguishing its connexion with the verb to *fare*, regarded it as a solitary alien, and therefore supposed it must have come from Greece; or at all events who perceived that it had nothing to do with *fear*, and wished to make this evident by their way of writing it. The labourer, says Sylvester (Dubartas i. p. 6),

> ———resteth yet at night,
> And in the arms of his deer pheer forgoes
> All former troubles and all former woes.

The same corrupt spelling is found in Tancred and Gismunda, Preface, ii. 3. iv. 3. In Ben Jonson, Silent Woman ii. 3, we read *bed-phere;* in Fairfax Tasso, iv. 47, *pheare.* Still, though Malone was probably right in substituting this word for *peer* in the prologue to Pericles, he might as well have spelt it correctly, where the old editions did not oblige him to do otherwise.

In Drydens letter to Dennis *sailor* is spelt *sailer;* and though the other form has very ancient authority in its favour, the latter is certainly more consistent with analogy. Yet it is not desirable or likely that any change here should become current, unless the navy were to fancy that their name ought to be a little less like *tailors.*

The *g* in *impregnable, imprenable,* from *prendre, prehendere,* appears to have been derived from an erroneous association with *impregnate, pregnant.*

Corn-chandler is a word formed after the false analogy of *wax-chandler, tallow-chandler;* as if *chandler* meant merely *monger* or *dealer.*

Pegge in his Anecdotes of the English language, p. 94, remarks that *fruiterer, poulterer, upholsterer* have had a superfluous syllable appended to them; that by Stowe the companies are termed *upholsters* and *poulters,* which mode of writing the names is retained in Strypes edition of 1720; and that *poulter* is used by Shakspeare in Henry the Fourth, F. P. II. 4. So is it by Webster, Vitt. Cor. II, Westward Ho. II. 1. The common surname too is *Poulter. Poulterer* seems to be a lengthened form of *poultrer,* from *poultry;* and *upholsterer* to come from *upholstery.* The latter words are supposed by our etymologers to be derivatives from the verb to *uphold;* and some *upholsterers* meaning to be wiser than their brethren have begun to entitle themselves *upholders.* But is not the theme of the word to be rather sought in the German *holz?* whence *holzen* and *aufholzen:* in older times we had a cognate word *holt* for a wood. Perhaps however all these words have been influenced by the common propensity to dwell upon and lengthen the final *r;* aided by the erroneous analogy of *pewterer, plaisterer, embroiderer.*

From the collection of cockneyisms in the same book, and from our provincial glossaries, a vast number of instances might be adduced of words corrupted by erroneous feelings of analogy similar to those which have been illustrated above: the only difference is that the corruption in them is usually grosser, and that the other class have received the stamp of general usage.

A *gown* is in cockney language a *gownd,* after the analogy of *pound, round, sound, ground.*

Drownd is *drownded* like *sounded, bounded.*

Dubious becomes *duberous; industrious industerous,* like *boisterous, slanderous, timorous, treacherous.*

Jocotious for *jocose* resembles *atrocious, ferocious.*

Scholard is assimilated to *drunkard, coward:*

Solentary for *solitary*, to *sedentary*, *voluntary*:
Nonplushd to *blushd*, *brushd*, *flushd*:
Mislest for *molest* to *mislead*, *mistrust*, from the notion that something wrong is implied in the word.

Words miscompounded with Prepositions.

Prepositions in composition are especially liable to be mistaken: a less common is easily supplanted by a commoner one in cases where the meaning of neither is very clearly understood; and sometimes people fancy they discern a preposition in a syllable which belongs to the theme of the word.

Thus the French write *antichambre* and *antidate*, being misled, by the false analogy of such words as *antidote*, *antipathie*, *antipode*, to substitute the Greek preposition ἀντὶ, against, for the Latin *ante*, before. The example of *anticiper* is hardly enough to justify this: for in the Latin *anticipo*, as in *antistes*, both parts of the word underwent modification: where that was not the case, the *e* was preserved, as in *antecedo*, *antesignanus*. To make a compensation of errours however, the French have converted *Antichrist* into *Antechrist*, from the before-mentioned tendency to employ uncommon spellings in forein words. We follow them in writing *antichamber*, and in the mongrel word formed after its model, *antiroom*.

Example—*exemplum*, from *eximo*, that which is *taken out* from other things—became *ensample* in old French, and is constantly written thus in Chaucer and in the Morte d'Arthur, as if it had been compounded with *en*. From *ensample* came the clipt form *sample*, and *sampler*. *Example* and *exemplar* were not introduced into the language till later; the latter immediately from the Latin, the former passing through the French, as is indicated by the *a*, which answers to the French sound of the middle vowel in *exemple*.

Emendare in like manner was converted into *amender* in old French, whence *amende*, and in English into

amend: which we then shortened into *mend*, perhaps mistaking the *a* for the Saxon prefix. *Emender* and *emend* are later importations brought in by the learned.

To *upbraid*, A. S. *upgebredan*, the original meaning of which seems to be deducible from the form used by Spenser, F. Q. III. 6. 50, *upbray*, was often corrupted into *obrayd*, as if it came from some Latin verb compounded with *ob:* for instance by Habington I. 52. 18:

> What makes some poets raile? why are their rimes
> So steept in gall? why so *obrayde* the times?

and II. 49. 15:

> And youth by female perjury betraid
> Will mourn his injuries and death *obrayd.*

The substitution of *obsequies* for *exequies* has taken place also in France. The latter form, which is the legitimate derivative from the Latin *exequiæ*, is the only one found in the Romane, and is used by our old writers. At present it is obsolete in both languages. Even in Latin however *obsequiæ* has been found in an inscription, and so, though not adopted in books, may perhaps have been a popular word.

Despatch is usually spelt *dispatch*, as if its preposition were *dis*. In Italian also it is written *dispecciare:* but as the word came to us from the French, *depecher*, which in the Romane was *despecier*, *despecher*, *despechier*, we ought to let this determine our orthography, unless the etymology of the word supplied us with a clear reason to the contrary. The resemblance of its present form, and the strict opposition of its present meaning, to those of *empècher*, *impedire*, would lead us to fancy that it must have come from a Latin verb *depedire* or *dispedire;* but no such word is to be found. The signification of *depecher* too has been very much modified by this very resemblance: in the Romane it means to destroy, to cut or break to pieces, to put an end to: the same is the sense of the L. L. *depescare*, which is formed from it:

but the origin of these words is very obscure: they are probably connected with *piece*, a word said to run through most of the Eastern languages, but which seems to have been introduced into those of modern Europe from the Celtic.

A like substitution of *dis* for the French *de* has taken place in a variety of instances, sometimes with reason, sometimes without. Indeed the similarity of the two prefixes, *de*, *from*, and *dis*, *asunder*, is such that they may often be interchanged unobjectionably: and where we make use of *dis* in forming new compounds, we *disregard* its Latin sense, and employ it as a mere privative or negative particle; for instance in *disable*, *disobey*, *dislodge*.

We have *depopulate* coming immediately from the Latin *depopulari*: but in another derivative from the same verb, which passed through the old French *despeupler*, we write *dispeople*.

Decharger, to unload, seems a better form than *discharge*: but the *s* in the old form *descharger* gave rise to *discargare* and *discaricare* in the Low Latin.

Discomfit on the other hand seems preferable to *deconfire*, from *disconficere*:

Disband to *debander*.

Dedaigner agrees better with the Latin *dedignari*, than *disdain*:

Devêtir with *devestire*, than *divest*:

Distress with *districtus*, than *detresse*.

Descry, though it comes from *descrier*, *describere*, is often found written *discry*: for instance by Milton, Com. 141, where the spelling in his manuscript agrees with that of the first edition. And yet the word in that passage retains much more of its original meaning than usual. Its later sense seems to have arisen, as Johnson remarks, from its being used of scouts giving an account of the enemy.

The French *deshabille* became *dishabille* on its very first introduction, as appears by the manner in which the name and dress are spoken of by Gay in the Guardian, No. 149.

In *disheveld* the consonant as well as the vowel is changed: since it comes from *decheveler*, which perhaps may at one time have been *descheveler*, compounded of *de* and *cheveil*, *capillus*.

The same propensity to change *des* into *dis* appears in *distruction*, Mirrour for Mag. Epist. Ded. in *dispayring* Induct. 15. Many analogous corruptions might be adduced which have not become current, but which explain the origin of such as have.

The preposition *ex* too has now and then been introduced unadvisedly.

In *exchequer* it has arisen out of the French *e*, which used to be perpetually prefixt, especially to words beginning with *sc* or *sp*, as in *eschelle* from *scala*, in *escole* from *schola*, in *esperer* from *spero*, in *esprit* from *spiritus*, *espoux* from *sponsus*, *espece* from *species*, *espine* from *spina*, *escume* from *spuma*, where the consonant also undergoes change. The old French *eschequier* is evidently formed in the same way from the L. L. *scaccarium*, the root of which is apparently to be found in the German *schatz*, the A. S. *skeata*, money.

The first syllable in *exchange* too seems to have a similar origin: for the old French *echanger* is probably nothing more than *changer* with the usual prefix. In the Low Latin indeed we find *excambiare* in a late age: but that also seems to be a derivative from the French.

Excise is *accise in* Germany, and used to be so written in England. Its original form however seems to have been *assize*, which we retain in our *assize* of bread. The duty imposed by an *assize* or meeting, of whatever kind, appears from Ducange to have borne the name of the body that imposed it.

Another preposition, *ad*, has very frequently been inserted into words it had nothing to do with: for instance,

In *advance*, *advantage*: Chaucer writes *avance*, *avantage*, from *avant*, *ab ante*; and so did Lord Berners and Sir T. More.

Aventure too is the form constantly used by Chaucer, and agrees with the French *aventure*, and the German *abentheuer*. But one cannot say that the *d* here is wrong: for in old French we also find *adventure* and *adventureux*; and in the Low Latin, beside *aventura*, the commonest form, both *eventura* and *adventura*. Nor is there anything to determine whether the original theme was *evenire* or *advenire*.

Admiral however in French is rightly *amiral*, which Milton writes *ammiral*, following the Italian *ammiraglio*. The corruption here was so natural that the *d* got also into the old French, *admiral*, and the L. L. *admiraldus*. Yet there is no question that the word comes from the Arabic *Emir*; which in the Byzantine writers appears under various forms, ἄμερ, ἀμηρᾶς, ἀμηρᾶιος, ἀμηράλιος; the latter especially when applied to a naval commander, the termination being perhaps modified to give it a connexion with ἅλς. This title never occurs in Western Europe till the Crusades; and in all the oldest passages is applied to Saracen commanders.

In a number of cases the preposition *ad* has taken place of the old Saxon prefix *a*, which used to be set before almost every kind of verb; but which has latterly been dropt, except in a few instances, such as *abide*, *abet*, *alight*, where it has become a permanent part of the word; and in others where it has been supplanted by *ad*, or some of its modifications. Our authors, being far more learned in Latin than in their mother tongue, when the form of the word made it supposable that this *a* might stand for *ad*, which in *abet* and *abide* was impossible, usually set about corrupting the spelling, or, as they fancied, correcting it.

Thus *advise* in Robert of Gloucester, Chaucer C. T. 788, 1870, Gower, is rightly *avise*, in the Morte d'Arthur commonly *avyse*, like the French *aviser*, being nothing more than the A. S. *wissan*,—the German *weisen*, whence our *wise*, and the old preterite *wist*—with the prefix. Chaucer uses the verb to *wisse*,

to shew or teach, C. T. 6590. 7440, as well as to *witte*, to know, whence *wit*, *wot*, and the phrase *to wit*, C.T. 9614; making the same distinction between them as the Germans make between *weisen* and *wissen*. A like corruption got into the L. L. *advisare*.

So to *acknowledge* used to be, to *knowlege* or *aknowlege*: that is to profess or *lay forth* ones *knowing*, from *know*, and *legan* to lay. The *c* was inserted to give it more of a Latin air.

From *coy*—which comes through the French *coy*, *coes*, from the Latin *coetus*, a corruption of *quietus*—was derived the verb to *coye*, to quiet, used by Chaucer Troilus II. 801, or, with the prefix, to *acoie*, Romaunt of the Rose 3564. The same verb is found in Draytons Shepherds Garland. But Spenser, (Shepheards Calender, Febr. 47) transforms it into *accoy*.

So again Chaucer uses to *acloy* for to *cloy*, Ass. of Foules, 517: and this again becomes *accloy* in Spenser, Shep. Cal. Febr. 135.

Thus *addeem* and *addoom*, used by Spenser F. Q. VI. 8. 22, and VII. 7. 56, ought surely to be *adeem* and *adoom*; and perhaps the poet would have written more correctly had he used the latter form in both places.

To *allay*, in Chaucer and Habington, is to *alay*, being the same word as to *lay*. Spenser (Sheph. Cal. March 5) retains the single *l* in the form *alegge*. In Shakspeare too, Temp. I. 2, it would be written *alay*, if the editors had not corrupted the text.

Afraid in Wycliffe is *afrayed*: that is, it is the participle from the verb, to *afray*, which consequently ought to be spelt with a single *f*, although the French not only doubled the consonant but changed the vowel in their derivative from it, *effrayer*. In this word even Chaucer uses two *f*s, C. T. 5557. 8331: but *afright* he spells rightly with only one; C. T. 1491. Spenser, F. Q. I. 1. 38. VI. 10. 35, has the simple form *frayde*; which in another passage, I. 1. 52—"What *frayes* ye, that were wont to comfort me *affraid*?—he uses along with its corrupted derivative. The

latter occurs also in the Sheph. Cal. March 94: elsewhere, as in F. Q. I. 1. 16, Spenser adopts the frenchified *effraide*. Fox uses the verb *fray* in the sense of frightening: "Such accusers must beware they play not the dog, which being set in *Capitolio* to *fray* away theeves by night, left the theeves and fell to barcke at true men walking in the day." So that Johnson, if he had known more about English, instead of saying that *afraid* should be written with *ff* as coming from the verb *affray*, would rather have recommended the leaving out an *f* in the verb.

Array in Chaucer is usually *aray* or *araie*: C. T. 41. 73. 718. 936. 1410. 1540. 1803. 2048. In some passages indeed, 332. 1391. 2092, the *r* is doubled: but this corruption, as there is no apparent reason for his deviating from his usual practice, may perhaps be attributed to the scribes, or else to the unsettled state of orthography; and either way it shews how natural the errour was. *Aray* stands in the Morte d'Arthur, I. 1. 10. Spenser uses *disarayde*, Sheph. Cal. Febr. 105, and the simple form *ray*, which, as Horne Tooke remarks (D. of P. II. 234), is a cognate word to *rig*. The notion of its being a Latin verb appears in the derivatives *raiment*, *arraiment*.

To *arest* too in Chaucer C. T. 829, in Gower, Grafton, has but one *r*; and coming from the A. S. *restan* has very needlessly borrowd a second from the French *arrêter*. The substantive Chaucer spells with two *r*s (C. T. 1312), as derived from the French lawterm.

To *allure*, in Lidgate *alure*, seems to come in the same way from to *lure*, a word belonging to hawking.

So *anneal*, in Gower *anele*, is from the A. S. *anælan*, to burn.

On the other hand the preposition *by* has in some of its compounds given way to the Saxon prefix *be*.

Behalf with Lord Berners is *bihalf*, *between* is *bitwene* or *bytwene*. *Because* even so late as with Holinshed is constantly *bicause*. In Sir T. Malorys time the two parts of this word had not yet coalesced.

"And therwith all (he says I. 7) they knelyd at ones both ryche and poure, and cryed Arthur mercy *by cause* they had delayed hym so longe; and Arthur foryaf hem, and took the swerd *bitwene* both his handes." This is still more apparent in Chaucer, C. T. 2490:

> But *by the cause* that they shulden rise
> Erly amorwe for to seen the fight.

The change however merely made the more recent compounds follow the example of the earlier: for the prefix *be* is only a different form of the preposition *by*, as the German *be* is of *bey:* indeed the preposition in A. S. is usually, and in our old poems often, written *be.*

There is no such good reason, when the verbal prefix *for* is confounded with *fore.* Though the two particles may perhaps be remotely connected, they are totally distinct words and have very different meanings. *Fore* in composition with nouns denotes the front or front part, as in *forefoot, forefinger, forehead, foreground:* to verbs it gives the sense of *before,* as in *forerun;* or of *beforehand,* as in *foresee, foretell, foreknow, forecast, forebode. For* on the other hand answers exactly to the German *ver,* which primarily, according to Grimm (Gramm. II. 851), was either privative, or implied some kind of perversion. Thus *fore* corresponds with the Latin *præ;* while the force of *for* or *ver* was often exprest by *pro* or *per. For* is privative in *forbear* (cease), *forbid* (*prohibeo*), *forget, forsake:* it denotes a perversion in *forswear* (*perjuro*). In some words it was intensive, especially when the simple verb implied anything of evil or pain or misfortune, as in *forlorn,* which itself is a forlorn word, the participle from the A. S. verb *forleoran, verlieren.* In *forgive* too, *vergeben,* the original sense seems to have been intensive; like that of *per* in *perdonare* (the L. L. substitute for *condonare*), from which come *pardonner, pardon.* In our oldest writers this prefix *for* was very

common; and a number of its compounds are used by Chaucer, which to the great detriment of our language have become obsolete. In some of these *for* has its perversive sense; as in

Forjuged, misjudged, Compl. of the Bl. Knight 274;
Forshapin, transformed, Troil. II. 66;
Forsleuthe (to waste and lose by sloth): "Accidie (says the Persone) *forsleutheth*, *forsluggeth*, and destroieth all goodes temporel by recchelesnesse."

Much oftener however it is intensive, as in

Forbrused, C. T. 14532;
Forwounded (*verwundet*), Rom. R. 1830;
Forwept, Chauc. Dreame, 1835;
Forfered, much afraid, C. T. 10841;
Fordry (*vertrocknet*), C. T. 10723;
Forwrapped, C. T. 12647: "Why art thou all *forwrapped* save thy face?"
Forwerie, *forwandred*, Rom. R. 3336;
Forwelkid (*verwelkt*), witherd away, Rom. 361:

A foule *forwelkid* thing was she,
That whilom round and soft had be:
Her face yfrouncid and *forpined*,
And bothe her hondis lorne *fordwined:*

Forpined again, C. T. 205: "He was not pale as a *forpined* gost:"
Forgrowen, Fl. and L. 45: "For it *forgrowen* was with grasse and weede:"
Forshronke, Fl. and L. 358;
Forwaked, C. T. 5016: "Wery, *forwaked* in hire orisons:"
Fordronken, C. T. 3122. 12608;
Fordrive, driven away, Rom. R. 3782;
Forsongin, wearied with singing, Rom. R. 664;
Forkerve, to carve through, C. T. 17289:

Right as a sword *forcutteth* and *forkerveth*
An arme atwo, my dere sone, right so
A tonge cutteth frendship all atwo.

These examples would incline one to suppose that the original force of the prefix *for* was intensive: from which its other senses might easily be deduced: for there is no definable limit to separate excess from perversion; and overdoing is a sure way of undoing.

Forstraught, C. T. 13035, is a mongrel substitute for *distracted*, which was often corrupted into *distraught*.

Forfaite (to misdo), Persones Tale—"And all this suffred our Lord Jesu Crist that never *forfaited*"—comes from the French verb *forfaire*, whence *forfait*, and our *forfeit*; in which verb the Teutonic prefix is combined with the derivative from the Latin *facere*. In the L. L. *forfaire* was renderd by *forisfacere*, as if it was a compound of *foris*.

Sackville too was very fond of similar compounds. In his Induction, we find "her body smale, *forwithred*, and *forspent*," 12, *forfaynt* 15, *forsunke* 20, *forlore* 48, *forbathde* 61: in the Complaynte of Buckingham *forwandred* 74, *forwaylde* 102. In this however he did not write arbitrarily, as Nares taxes him with doing, but in perfect consistency with the genius of our language. In some instances *for* in him is already corrupted into *fore*; as in "with anguish all *foredone*," Ind. 19; instead of which, in Buck. 22, stands correctly "with heapes of grief *fordone*." So *forewast*, Ind. 44, ought perhaps to be *forwast*, utterly wasted; though it may also mean previously wasted. *Foretossed*, Buck. 33,—"Still to the death *foretossed* with the wave Of restles woe,"—should be *fortossed*. So should *foreyrking* rather be *foryrking* in Buck. 46,

> For loe, his wife, *foreyrking* of his raigne,
> Sleping in bed this cruell wretch hath slaine.

Spenser again has several more of these compounds than we now use.

Forhaile, forswoncke, forswatte occur in the Shepheards Calender:

Fordoo in the F. Q. v. 12. 3;

Forpined, III. x. 57;

Forthinke, VI. 4. 32, which the commentators misunderstanding would change into *forethink*, though Chaucer uses *forthinke* in the very same sense, to express vexation, annoyance, C. T. 9780, Rom. R. 1671, Troil. II. 1414;

Forwarne, F. Q. III. 5. 9, *forhent*, III. 4. 49, where Upton would needlessly thrust in *forewarne*, *forehent*;

Forwearied I. 1. 32. 9. 13.

But even in Spensers own editions several of these forms were already corrupted.

Foretaught, F. Q. I. 7. 18, seems certainly to mean not *taught beforehand*, but *fortaught*, mistaught.

Forelent, F. Q. IV. 3. 6, seems rather to mean *forlent*, *verliehen*, given away, than given *beforehand*; and *forlent* is rightly used in the same sense, F. Q. III. 4. 47; where Church misunderstands it, and Upton again wants to corrupt it into *forelent*.

Foreslacked too in the State of Ireland, p. 305, is clearly a corruption of *forslackt*; which occurs in the F. Q. V. 12. 3, VI. 9. 3, and has the same sesne with *forslow*, IV. 10. 15. Whether the errours in these instances are referable to Spenser, or rather to his printer, they shew that this corruption was already gaining ground.

In like manner *fordo*, to undo, (*perdo*), is often converted into *foredo*. In Hamlet, V. 1,

> ———This doth betoken
> The corse they follow did with desperate hand
> *Fordo* its own life.—

the text is correct. So is *fordid* in Lear V. 3; and *fordone* in the Mids. N. D. V. 2. But in Polonius speech to Ophelia, II. 1,—

> This is the very extasie of love,
> Whose violent property *foredoes* itself—

and Iagos, V. 1,

> ———this is the night
> That either makes me or *foredoes* me quight,

it is corrupted. So *foreslow* in Henry the Sixth, T. P. II. 3, is a corruption of Spensers *forslow*, used correctly by Marlowe, Edward the Second, II. 3.

Forefend seems also, at least in some instances, to be a corruption from *forfend:* however in this, as in other cases, after the corruption had once been establisht, the meaning was at times modified to suit it.

To *foreclose* in our old writers is *forclose*, and is clearly the same word with *verschliessen.*

Forego in the sense of *going without*, resigning, ought unquestionably to be written *forgo*, as Spenser, Hooker, Shakspeare wrote it. Here again however the editors have been perversely busy in corrupting the text; substituting *forego* instead of *forgo*, the reading of the first folio, in the Tempest, III. 3, in Richard the Second, IV. 1—"My manors, rents, revenues I *forgoe*"—in Henry the Eighth, III. 2—"Must I needes *forgo* So good, so noble, and so true a master" —in Hamlet, II. 2—"I have of late *forgone* all custome of exercise." In Othello, III. 3, the old edition has—"But this denoted a *foregone* conclusion:" the distinction of the words being rightly preserved, though our modern dablers in black letter had never the wit to discover it. Great indeed has been the evil produced by the licence with which editors have taken upon themselves to deface the remains of our great authors, those most precious monuments of our language. If its orthography had been settled by competent authorities, some sort of excuse might be offerd for such proceedings: though even then it would be far better that we should read the works of our classical writers in the form in which they left them, as by so doing we should become gradually familiarized with the progressive history of the English tongue. But since the lexicographer by whose verdict such matters are usually supposed to have been decided, was so ill qualified for the task, it becomes of great importance that we should refresh ourselves by returning to the purer sources of the language, in order to stop the

progress of that corruption which through our ignorance is perpetually on the increase. The same word *forgo* has been corrupted into *forego* in Miltons Hymn on the Nativity, 196, where the poet wrote "While each peculiar power *forgoes* his wonted seat;" and in Paradise Lost, IX. 908,

> How can I live without thee, how *forgoe*
> Thy sweet converse and love?

Indeed in almost every instance where the authors wrote correctly, the text has been corrupted by their editors.

So to *forelay*, to lie in wait for, should be *forlay*.
Forespent in most places should rather be *forspent*.

Corruptions of this sort are not confined to our own language, though perhaps more numerous there than in others, owing to the discordant medley of elements it is composed of, and to the utter neglect it has been treated with in most of our systems of education, as if the mother tongue meant in the strictest sense that which none but a mother is to teach. Even in Greek however, where the analogies which regulated the formation of words were usually so clear, and the resolution of a word into its component parts so simple a process, one occasionally meets with mistakes something like those just exemplified. The following instances are given by Buttmann in his grammar, I. 345.

Ἡμφεσβήτουν is found even in Plato, as if the first half of the word was the preposition ἀμφὶ, instead of the adverb ἄμφις.

Παρηνόμουν is used by Thucydides and Demosthenes, as if παρανομέω had been compounded of παρὰ and ἀνομέω, instead of being a derivative from παράνομος.

Διαιτάω and διακονέω, derivatives from δίαιτα and διάκονος, formed διήτησα, δεδιηκόνηκα, as if compounded of διὰ with αἰτάω and ἀκονέω.

In later times some extravagant corruptions of the same kind, such as ἀνηξιοπάθει, ἀνήγκακα, περιέσσευσε,

gaind ground; against which the grammarians warn us: they serve however to illustrate the operation of the same principles which have been so active in disfiguring our own language.

A good many words have got an additional syllable or letter by incorporating the article or a part of it.

This has been especially the case with the Arabic article *al:* it has become an inseparable part of several words to which it was habitually prefixt; and before the compound thus produced we place our English articles.

Thus we say the *alcoran* as well as the *coran*, though *al coran* is itself *the coran*, the book, τὸ βίβλιον.

In the same way the *chemy* of the middle ages was called *alchemy*, and the pursuer of it *an alchemist:* nor should we scruple to say *the alchemy* of the middle ages: and Milton speaks of the "cherubim putting to their mouths *the* sounding *alchymie:*" P. L. II. 517. When different views of natural philosophy became prevalent, the *alchemists*, to distinguish themselves from their predecessors, began to call themselves *chemists:* and in this instance the name of the science, *chemistry*, was derived from that of its professors.

The same accretion has taken place in *alcohol*, *alkali*, *alkermes*.

Alcove, a word which has spred through the modern European languages from the Spanish *alcoba*, is said to come from the Arabic *al kubbah*, an arch.

Alligator, it is clear from the passages quoted by Todd, comes from the Spanish and Portuguese *lagarto*, *lacerta*, a lizard, with the article. Sir T. Herbert says in his account of Sumatra that the animal is by "seamen improperly cald *alligator*, corrupted from *allegardos*, a mixture of Spanish and Alman language;" conceiving seemingly that it was a compound of *alle* and some Spanish word. Baldæus in his Description of Ceylon, c. 51, (Churchill III. 826) states that the

kaiman or crocodile is called *lagarto* by the Portuguese. One of Cavendishes companions, in Purchas, Vol. IV. p. 1228, speaks of the same name as prevailing in the Brazils. "In this place I have seen very great water *aligartos*, which we call in English crocodiles, seven yards long." The attempt to connect the word *alligator* with the Latin verb *alligare* is apparent.

In old English our definite article would often coalesce with the next word when it began with a vowel. In Lord Berners preface we find *thexpert* for *the expert*, *thistographier* for *the historiographer*. The first words in his translation are: "To *thentent* that the honorable and noble aventures of featis of armes shulde notably be inregistred." Thus *the other* became *tother*, the first aspirate being dropt, as is the case in Greek when two consecutive syllables ought each to contain one: for instance in θρὶξ τριχός, ἔχω ἕξω, τρέφω θρέψω, ταχὺς θάσσων. Owing to this, and *tother* being a very familiar word, it was forgotten that the article was comprised in it, and people talkt of the one and *the tother*: which occurs for instance in Westward Ho, II. 1, and in Maundevile, p. 270, 277.

So the French say *le lendemain*, though *lendemain* is already *l'endemain*.

Lierre is a contraction of *l'hierre*, from *hedera*:

Landier of *l'andier*, which is the same word as our *andiron*:

Lambris of *l'ambris*, from the Latin *ambrix*, a lath:

Lingot of *l'ingot*, from the German *einguss*, our *ingot*:

Luette of *l'uette*, from the Latin *uva*.

Thus in borrowing from the French the term *l'envoi*, used by them to designate a kind of epilogue to their poems, our poets regarded it as a single word, and wrote *a lenvoy*, *the lenvoy*. In the humorous dialogue on the subject among Armado, Moth, and Costard, L. L. L. III. 1, it occurs a dozen times, and in the old folio is always printed as a single word: but the corrupters of Shakspeares text have divided it into two, thus encumbering their author with a useless piece of

learning, for the sake of sticking upon it a piece of ungrammatical stupidity. As the scene stands in the modern editions, one is every moment offended by a sin against the first principles of language. Shakspeare could no more have said *thy l'envoy, no l'envoy, the l'envoy, a good l'envoy, a fat l'envoy*, than he could have said *thy the riddle, no the riddle, the the riddle, a good the riddle, a fat the riddle.* Write *lenvoy* in these passages, as it is spelt almost uniformly in the judicious reprint of the Mirrour for Magistrates, and every objection is removed. These importunate obtruders of their scantling of knowledge might just as well put *the al coran, the al ligator, le l'ierre.* It is to be regretted that a man of Giffords good sense should have been misled by such examples into printing, "I kept that for the *l'envoy*," "I look'd for this *l'envoy*," in Massinger, Bashful Lover, IV. 1, V. 1.

Lavolta on the other hand the editors have written after the old fashion as one word: though here too the first syllable is the article, and the only doubt is whether the remainder be the French *volte*, or the Italian *volta.* Florio, Nares observes, calls it a French dance; and Shakspeare, in Troil. and Cress. IV. 4, writes "I cannot sing, Nor heel *the high lavolt.*" The Italian form of the word however is much commoner: and in the Suns Darling, II. 1, the name *Signor Lavolta* is given to an Italian dancer, who "tesha all de bella corantoes, gagliardas, piamettas, capeorettas, amorettas, dolce dolce." Whichever may have been the immediate source of the word, it is clearly akin to our *vault*, and to the German *walz*, which perhaps is only a Germanized form of it. Gifford, on Massinger, II. 497, has remarkt the identity of the two dances, which is clearly establisht by the often quoted lines from Sir J. Davies Orchestra: stanz. 70.

Yet is there one the most delightfull kind,
A loftie jumping, or a leaping round,
Where arme in arme two dauncers are entwind,
And whirle themselves with strict embracements bound,

And still their feet an anapest do sound:
An anapest is all their musicks song,
Whose first two feet are short, and third is long.

As the victorious twinnes of Leda and Jove,
That taught the Spartans dauncing on the sands
Of swift Eurotas, daunce in heaven above
Knit and united with eternall hands;
Among the starres their double image stands,
Where both are carried with an equall pace,
Together jumping in their turning race.

This is the net wherein the sunns bright eye
Venus and Mars entangled did behold:
For in this daunce their armes they so imply
As each doth seeme the other to enfold.
What if lewd wits another tale have told
Of jealous Vulcan, and of yron chains!
Yet this true sence that forged lye containes.

The *lofty jumping* indeed has been abated; and that this was a characteristic feature is manifest from the common epithet, *high lavolta:* but in other respects this description would suit the dance which we have lately reimported: the very measure is the same. Fletcher in the Fair Maid of the Inn, III. 1, calls a person by a new-coind word "a *lavoltetere*, a saltatory, one that by teaching great *madonnas* to foot it, has miraculously purchased a ribanded waistcoat, and four clean pair of socks."

In the passage just quoted we find a word with which the possessive pronoun, being habitually prefixt to it in common speech, has in like manner coalesced. In Italian this compound is only used in particular cases, and more especially with reference to *Our Lady, Notre Dame.* So the French, having no word for a gentleman, say *un monsieur;* which name we apply somewhat contemptuously when we speak of *the monsieurs of France,* corrupting it in our vulgar language into *mounseers.* They are even with us in talking of *un milord Anglais.* In certain cases too we should not scruple to say *a madam, a mademoiselle:* and in the

Romish church the person who ranks next to a cardinal, is *a monsignore.*

In *newt* and some other words the final *n* of the indefinite article has been drawn away from it and attacht to the noun. "In the abbeye of Seynte Kateryne at the foot of Mount Sinay (says Maundevile, p. 74) ne entrethe not no flye ne todes ne *ewtes*, ne such foule venymouse bestes, ne lyzs ne flees, by the myracle of God and of oure Lady. For there were wont to be many suche manere of filthes, that the monkes weren in wille to leve the place, and weren gon fro thens upon the mountayne aboven for to eschewe that place. And oure Lady cam to hem, and bad hem tournen azen: and fro this forewardes nevere entred suche filthe in that place amonges hem, ne nevere schalle entre here aftre." *Eft*, which is only another form of *ewt*, is still in use: the Anglosaxon is *efeta.*

In like manner *an awl* was changed into *a nawl*, a word used by Fletcher, Women Pleased iv. 1:

> ———Every man
> Shall have a special care of his own soal,
> And in his pocket carry his two confessors,
> His lingel and his *nawl.*

The same form, or *nall*, is used by others.

Nares conjectures with great plausibility that *a nidget* is a corruption of *an idiot.*

Thus *ningle* arose out of *an ingle*, or *mine ingle; ingle* itself being a corruption of *angel.*

Nuncle too came in like manner from *mine uncle.*

On the other hand we have some words from which the initial *n* has been rubbed off, as if it had belonged to the article.

Douce (Illust. of Shaksp. ii. 7) quotes an instance of the form *napron* from the Pardonere and Tapstere, publisht in Urrys Chaucer, p. 594. From this it certainly looks as if *an apron* were a corruption of *a napron*, from the old French *naperon*, a derivative from *nappe*, which

comes from the Latin *mappa*, and is the source of *napkin*. Roquefort however also gives the words *apronier* and *apronaire*, as signifying a *tablier*.

An adder is *a nedre* in Robert of Gloucester, *nædḍra* or *nædḍre* in Anglosaxon, a *natter* in German. In some of the German dialects the form *atter* prevails; which leads Adelung to consider this as the older word, and as of the same family with *otter*, *eitter*, the A. S. *æter*, poison, and our own provincial words *atter*, corrupt matter, and *attercop* or *cob*, a cup of poison, a spiders web, and hence a spider itself. If this be the true derivation, the converse change has taken place, and the *n* of the article has stuck to the noun. But all the oldest authorities are the other way. The A. S. *nædḍre* is confirmed by *natar* in Ottfried, *natru* in Tatian, *nadra* in Isidor, *nade* in Ulphilas, and by the Latin *natrix*, which is clearly the same word. The other form however is also of great antiquity: Wiclif has, "ye generacioun of *eddris*," Matt. xii. 34: Maundevile, p. 33, "there fleyghe out *an eddere* righte hidous to see." In another place however, p. 244, he speaks of "dwerghes (dwarfs) that han no tonge, and therfore thei speke not, but thei maken a maner of hissynge, as *a neddre* doth, and thei maken signes on to another, as monkes don:" and again, p. 247, "In Mancy there is gret plentee of *neddres*, of whom men maken grete festes, and eten hem at grete solempnytees. And he that makethe there a feste, be it never so costifous, and he have no *neddres*, he hathe no thanke for his travaylle:" so that perhaps he wrote *a neddre* in the first passage. In Chaucer however we find the modern word, *an adder*.

The old word *an ouch* for a broche or other jeweld ornament, used in our version of Exodus, xxviii. 11. 13. 14. 25, xxxix. 13. 18, in Shakspeares Henry iv. S. P. ii. 4, and elsewhere, is written *a nouche* in Tyrwhitts Chaucer on the authority of the best manuscripts, and seems to be the same word with the L. L. *nocia*, *nosca*, or *nusca*, and the old German *nüschin*; which is pro-

bably a derivative from *nuss*, a *nut*, and might aptly be applied to any bossy ornament.

An eyas too, a young hawk, seems to be a corruption of *a nyas* or *nias*, from the French *niais*, a derivative from *nid*, *nidus*, used appropriately of a young hawk. It has indeed also been traced to *ey*, an egg: but *eyas* would hardly be a regular Saxon derivative, and the chief part of our words belonging to falconry, as Nares observes, are of French origin. "The heap of artificial terms on this subject (says Sir T. Brown in his tract on Hawks) first entred with the French artists: who seem to have been the first and noblest falconers in the western part of Europe, although in their language they have no word which in general expresseth an *hawk*." It is in reference to this that Hamlet says, II. 2, "we'll e'en to't *like French falconers*, fly at any thing we see." Malone too observes that *an eyas* hawk is sometimes written *a nyas* hawk; and in the very passage on which this remark is made the old folio reads "little '*Yases:*" Hamlet II. 2. The corruption however, if it be one, took place very early. Spenser, F. Q. I. 11. 34, writes "like *eyas hauke;*" and in the Hymne of Heavenly Love, 24, "Ere flitting Time could wag his *eyas* wings." No doubt too the circulation of *eyas* was favourd by its being associated with *ey*. In speaking of pheasants our sportsmen still retain the expression *a nye:* which, if they were called upon to write it, many of them would probably concur with Johnson in spelling *an eye*.

In some words which lost the *a* they used to begin with, one may believe that this curtailment was promoted, if not suggested, by the notion that it was the indefinite article.

The form *prentice* for instance is of very great antiquity in our language. From the fragment of the Cokes Tale, where *prentis* occurs half a dozen times, this, it is plain, was the popular word in Chaucers time. So was it in that of Elizabeth and James I, as appears

from the title of Heywoods *Four Prentices* of London, and from the various plays in which a *Prentice* is one of the characters, for instance in Eastward Ho, Westward Ho, and Northward Ho. The youthful poems publisht by James I, in 1584, were entitled *The Essayes of a Prentise in the divine Art of Poesie.* To this day too it is the word used by the lower orders. Still *apprentice* must have been the original, being the only form found in French, whence we derived it; and in our ancient statutes and law-books the class are called *apprenticii.* Another derivation indeed has been suggested. The author of the Cities Advocate, a pamphlet publisht in 1628 to shew that "*Apprentiship* doth not extinguish gentry," says p. 10: "It is urged that although *apprentiship* bee not a true bondage, yet that it is a temporary bondage, and equal, for the time it lasteth, to very servitude. In which opinion Erasmus is, making his etymologie of our *prentises* to be, for that they are like to such as are bought with money, *pares emptitiis;* which conceipt, as it is more literate than happie, so, if it were set to sale, would find few chapmen, but to laugh at it. For *Erasmus* is as well proved to be *errans mus* in the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum,* as *apprentises* in England to be *pares emptitiis.* But we absolutely deny that apprentiship is in any sort a kinde of bondage. For notwithstanding that to prove it so they make a parallel between the ancient Roman servitude and the London apprentiship, yet will these *comparata* be found *disparata,* if not *disparatissima.* For *servus* among the old Romans was so called of *servando,* and not of *serviendo,* saith the lawmaker himselfe, the emperor Justinian. But *apprentise* commeth of *aprenti,* the French word, a raw souldier, or young learner, *tyro, rudis discipulus;* or of the French verbe which signifies to learne, or of the Latine word *apprehendo* or *apprendo,* which properly is to lay hold of, and translatively to learne." Polydore Vergil too, when speaking of the

privileges granted to the city of London by Richard I, in return for the money they gave him for his crusade, says, that the citizens, "dum serviunt aliorumque ministri sunt, vocabulo non ineleganti appellantur *paremptitii*, hoc est, *pares emptitiis* servis, quia perinde in eos ac dominis in servos jus ferme est." Whoever first hit on this explanation of the word—for Polydore Vergil was a contemporary of Erasmus—it is clear that *paremptitius* is the Latin rendering, not of *apprentice*, but of the popular form *prentice*; which shews the complete predominance of the latter. Walsingham however, who lived under Henry VI, concurs with the old lawbooks in using *apprenticius*. When describing the insurrection in the 4th year of Richard II, p. 260, ed. 1574, he says: "Etiam locum qui vocatur Temple Barre, in quo *apprenticii juris* morabantur nobiliores, diruerunt." Sir Thomas Smith too in his treatise de Republica Anglorum, III. 8, has the right form *apprentice*, and derives it from the French *apprendre*. Holinshed, though under the 12th of Elizabeth he tells us that "a *prentise* of London was hanged for killing his master," under the 1st of Richard I, when describing the institutions of the city, properly uses the more correct form, and writes: "such are admitted to the fellowships of the companies as have truelie served as *apprentises* a certeine number of yeares." In Chaucer too we find *aprentise*, Rom. R. 687:

> Ententife werin for to sing
> These birdis, that not unkonning
> Were of ther craft and *aprentise*,
> But of song subtill and eke wise.

Here however *aprentise* means not a person, but skill, art. The person, it is clear, was in popular language denominated from the first *a prentice* or *prentis*, the initial *a* being probably mistaken for the article. Indeed if anybody were to say that his son was gone *as apprentice* to such a one, those who knew

no better would understand him to say that he was gone *as a prentice.*

With regard to *potecary* on the other hand it is maintaind by Pegge, whose opinion is adopted by Todd, that our word does not come from the Latin *apothecarius*, but from its French derivative *bouticaire*, or from the Spanish *boticario*, which Todd fetches from *bote*, a gallipot, saying that *apothecary* is a modern word in comparison to *pothecary*. Chaucer, it is true, writes *potecary*, C. T. 12786. 12793: and such is the usual form in our oldest writers, and continued to be so when Heywood wrote his Four Ps, about 1540, a *poticary* being one of them. In Maundeviles Travailes however, p. 62, we find: "the marchauntis and the *apotecaries* countrefeten bawme eftsones:" and Chaucer himself says of his Doctour of Phisike, C. T. 427:

> Ful redy hadde he his *apothecaries*
> To send him dragges, and his lettuaries.

Besides, though the Spanish *boticario*, coming in like manner from *apothecarius*, has the same peculiar meaning, it does not appear that *bouticaire* was ever used so: and even if it could be made out that our first *apothecaries* came from Spain, they were more likely to take a Latin name than a Spanish; though perhaps it was among the Spaniards, or rather the Arabians, that *botica* or *apotheca*, which among the Romans meant a store-room, or sometimes a wine-cellar, and which in the middle ages seems to have been a warehouse for all such things as are now embraced under the head of grocery, was first applied to a druggists shop. The earliest mention of an apothecary in Rymers Fœdera however, according to Anderson, is under the year 1345, Vol. v. p. 486, where Edward III orders that Coursus de Gangeland, *apothecarius Londoniæ*, should have a pension for life on account of the care he had taken of the king during his Scotch expedition. This apothecary must

have been something more than a mere druggist; and if he was a foreiner, his name would indicate that he was not a Spaniard, but a German. Beckmann (Hist of Inv. II. 125.) says that a family named *Apotheker* was living at Augsburg in the latter part of the 13th century, who probably exercised the craft hereditarily, after the manner of the times. The oldest instance of the word *apotheca* used with special relation to medicine seems to be in the Sicilian Constitutions, III. 34, where, in a law of the emperor Frederic II, enacted about the year 1230, regulating the medical profession, and forbidding all partnership between the physicians and the *confectionarii* or druggists, *apotheca* occurs twice, to denote the warehouse of the *confectionarius*. In this law the medical school of Salerno is mentiond several times: this was founded by Constantinus Afer, who in the latter part of the 11th century first introduced scientific medicine from Africa into Italy: so, as we find the same word used in the south of Italy and in Spain, it probably came in both cases from the same source, the Arabians. In 1561 was publisht at Cologne "A most excellent and perfecte homish *Apothecarye* or homely Physickbooke, translated out the Almaine speche into English by Jhon Hollybush:" and that the word had been remodeld in Shakspeares days and brought to conform to its primitive, we see from the scene in Romeo and Juliet. That this was the time when the change with regard to its usage took place, appears from Websters Vittoria Corombona. In the trial scene the word occurs thrice within a few lines, and in the quarto of 1612 is in all three passages a quadrisyllable, but has the *a* uniformly prefixt to it in the quarto of 1631: whence one may infer that *potecary* was then beginning to be thought vulgar. Where a corruption is so natural as that of *an apothecary* into *a pothecary* or *potecary*, it is quite idle to suppose that they are two distinct words.

The history of *alembic* is rather curious. Ἄμβιξ is the name of a peculiar Greek vessel described by Athenæus, xi. 60, as φοξίχειλος, or narrow-mouthed: and where Dioscorides is describing the process of extracting quicksilver, v. 110, he says, that an iron shell filled with cinnabar, being placed in an earthenware vessel, is inclosed in an ἄμβιξ with a coating of clay; then it is set on a charcoal fire; and the vapour which adheres to the *ambix*, on being coold is quicksilver. This word being adopted by the Arabian alchemists was used along with their article; and from the combination of the two came the Latin *alambix*, or *alembix*: just as the same article uniting with the Greek μεγίστη gave rise to *Almagest*, the name usually applied to the Μεγάλη Σύνταξις of Ptolemy. *Alembix* our learned chemists renderd by *alembick*: but in the common English form, used by our best writers, the first letter was restored to something like its original purpose, and instead of *an alembick* they said *a limbeck*.

If *a dab* too be a corruption of *an adab*, as Todd ingeniously conjectures, that Arabic word has been similarly divided. He refers to Hunts Essay De Antiquitate Linguæ Arabicæ, p. 43, who there deduces the name of the *adepts*, used to designate men skilled in chemistry, from the Arabic *adab*, "quod iis præcipue competit qui res mirandas, quales præ se ferunt chymici, didicerunt." This notion wants indeed historical confirmation: but it was natural that the alchemists should take an Arabic term; the explanation of *adeptus*, as denoting a person who had obtaind either the highest degree or the great secret, is by no means conclusive, though it would be a not unlikely way of Latinizing *adab* or *adeeboun*; and there is nothing improbable in a phrase, which belonged to an art once so generally diffused, being preserved in our popular language.

An anatomy again would hardly have been curtaild into *an atomy*, as it is in Shakspeares Henry IV, S. P. v. 4,

—where Dame Quickly and Doll Tearesheete call the beadle "You starved bloodhound! Goodman death! Goodman bones! Thou *atomy* thou! You thinne thing! you rascall!"—unless the first syllable of *anatomy* had been confounded with the article. Whalley indeed supposes that *atomy* in this passage means an *atom:* but his conjecture is refuted by the tenour of the context; and the first folio reads "thou *anatomy* thou" for the *atomy* of the quarto of 1600. In slang language *atomy* has since been corrupted into *otamy*, used for instance in the Beggars Opera, II. 1: "Poor brother Tom had an accident this time twelvemonth; and so clever a made fellow he was, that I could not save him from those fleaing rascals, the surgeons; and now, poor man, he is among the *otamies* at Surgeons Hall." By Grose this word is spelt *ottomy;* from which comes *ottomized* for *anatomized.*

Mistakes in the Inflexion of Words, arising from Ignorance of their Ancient Forms, or from False Analogies.

Acquaintance occurs several times in our Bible, signifying the persons with whom one is *acquainted,* like the French *connoissances.* In course of time it was used for a single individual, and the aggregate was exprest by the plural *acquaintances.* Afterward people fancied that *acquaintance* must be a corruption of *acquaintants,* although if there had been such an old word as *acquaintant,* it would hardly have had a passive sense; and even Swift gave into this, erroneous as it seems to be.

As *acquaintance* is properly used both for our knowledge of a person, and for the person whom we know; so *relation* not only expresses kindred, but is used for any person of our kin. Here too attempts have very needlessly been made to escape from the ambiguity: one class have invented the word *relative* for the person, which is less appropriate, inasmuch

as a *relation* means *one who is related*, a *relative*, *one who bears a relation*, and the former is assuredly the more natural idea in such a case: another class have coind the abstract term *relationship*, in which the Teutonic termination of quality is clumsily tackt on to the tail of the Latin one. When *connexion* becomes a more familiar term, the corrupters of our language will probably talk of *connexives* and *connexionships*.

Accidence on the other hand in its grammatical sense stands for the *accidents* of language, the properties of words, quæ vocibus *accidunt*. The origin of this expression we find in Quintilian, I. 5. 41; "verbo plurima *accidunt*, ideoque in eo fiunt soloecismi per *genera*, *tempora*, *personas*, *modos*." So Priscian, VIII. 1. 2: Verbo *accidunt* octo, significatio sive genus, tempus, &c. Sciendum autem, quædam verba inveniri defectiva quorundam supradictorum *accidentium*." And Diomedes: "Nomini *accidunt* observationes hæ. —Verbo *accidunt* tempora cum personis sociata." Milton seems to have mistaken the meaning of this word, when he prefixt his strange title to his tract, *Accedence commenced Grammar*, as if it implied that which was *accessory* to grammar. Or he may perhaps have been misled by some Latin grammarian: for Pompeius, in his recently publisht commentary on Donatus, uniformly substitutes *accedunt* for Quintilians much better word *accidunt*. "Nomini *accedunt* sex," he says, VIII. 3: "verbo *accedunt* septem," XX. 3. Even when he is quoting Donatus, we find in his text "nomini *accedunt* hæ res:" though in the editions of Donatus we read *accidunt*. Servius too in his Ars Grammatica writes, §. 7: "Adverbio *accidunt* octo." Nor can there be any question about this being the right word: for inflexions are not *accessories* to a word, but modifications of it; at all events according to the views of the ancient grammarians. In English however, if not in Latin, Milton had precedent for *accedence*. In Brinslys Ludus

Literarius, or Grammar Schoole, publisht in 1612, the word is uniformly miswritten so.

In the Preface to the Translation of Linschotens Voyages it is said that the author had diligently "collected all *occurrents* and accidents in his memory and knowledge:" and this is the old form of the word, which is perfectly analogous to *accidents* and *incidents*. This plural *occurrents* however was transformed into *occurrence*, and a modern writer would say, *occurrences* and *accidents*. Hamlets last words are

> But I do prophesie th' election lights
> On Fortinbras: he has my dying voice:
> So tell him, with the *occurrents* more and less
> Which have solicited . . . the rest is silence.

But even in Shakspeares time the other form was coming into use. In Twelfth Night, v. 1.—where Viola says

> All the *occurrence* of my fortune since
> Hath beene betweene this lady and this lord—

we see the plural turnd into a singular. In the chorus to the fifth act of Henry V, *occurrences* is used just as we should use it.

In several words which occur oftener in the plural than the singular, having forgotten the import of the old Saxon plural in *en*,—which to the great detriment of our language, already overstockt with sibilants, has had to give way with a very few exceptions to the less harmonious form in *s*,—we adopt the old plural as a singular, and then form a new plural by sticking on *s* to it.

Thus *chicken*, the old plural of *chick*, like *oxen* of *ox*, is now, except in a few proverbial or provincial phrases, used as a singular; and from it is formed the cumulative plural *chickens*.

So from *stocken*, the old plural of *stock*, was formed *stockens*, afterward changed into *stockings*. Horne

Tooke explains this to mean that which is *stuck* or made with *sticking pins*. But why should it not be that into which our legs are *stuck*? just as the *stocks* are that into which a rioter or a thief, or a mans money is *stuck*.

From *housen*, the plural of *house* or *hose*, came *housens* and *housings*.

Such being the case even in our own words, it is not to be wonderd at that we should have misunderstood the nature of the Hebrew plurals *Cherubim* and *Seraphim*, and formed new plurals *Cherubims* and *Seraphims*, used even in our version of the Bible: or that having changed *Moslemin* into *Mussulman*, we should forget that *man* is a mere termination, and often write the plural *Mussulmen*, like *Englishmen*; though in fact it is no better a plural than *Romen* or *Germen*.

Another frequent errour has arisen from a blunder about the nature of the only case we have retaind. It is now pretty generally known that the languages of the Teutonic family were in ancient times rich in inflexions, so as in this respect to approach nearly to the Latin and Greek: nor was the Anglosaxon poorer than her sister dialects; though on her union with the Norman she lost them almost entirely. What took place then was exactly similar to what W. Schlegel in his very elegant and ingenious Essay on Provençal Literature, p. 22, has remarkt of the Romanesque languages: "Du concours de deux langues qui toutes les deux avoient une grammaire *synthétique*, (that is, which were fond of expressing modifications of the meaning of verbs or nouns by modifications of the word itself), sont nées des langues dans lesquelles le systéme *analytique* a pris le plus grand developpement (that is, which express such modifications mostly by means of prepositions and other auxiliaries)." In another place (Indische Bibliothek. 1. 284) the same writer, after repeating the observation that when languages intermix "coeunt quidem paullatim in novum corpus peregrina vocabula, sed

grammatica linguarum, unde petitæ sunt, ratio perit," illustrates it by a reference to what happend in England. "Lingua Anglo-Saxonica satis doctam habebat grammaticam, et accurate jam ab Alfredi ætate excultam: nunc pauca ejus vestigia manent; nec verba e lingua Romana vulgari Galliæ desumta uberiorem suam conjugationem, jure hereditario a Latinis acceptam, servarunt. Ita lingua Anglica obmutuit pæne in terminationibus variandis, et constructionem verborum plerumque solo ordine, quo se excipiunt, indicat, quo vitio et linguæ Romanæ plus minusve laborant." From this he infers that a language in which the modifications of words are mainly exprest by auxiliaries, may fairly be suspected of being a mixt language: but ingenious as this observation is, the examples of the modern Greek and Italian shew the necessity of caution in applying it. Of our Anglosaxon cases we kept but one, the genitive, and that only in particular constructions; for this genitive must always precede the noun it depends on. Thus becoming unused to inflexions, we lost the perception of their meaning and nature; and the precursors of Horne Tooke in the sixteenth century fancied that the *s* of the genitive stood for *his*. Under this notion *his* was often written at length, especially where the noun ended in *s*. In the Mirrour for Magistrates we find "by *Mars his* force," I. 1. 10, "to *Hercules his* pillers," I. 1. 35., and so on. In Gerardes Herbal this corruption occurs perpetually. The title of Sylvesters translation is "*Dubartas his Divine Weekes.*" Even Spenser, though one is loth to detect errour in a writer to whom the language owes so much, has "*Pegasus his kynd,*" I. 9. 21, *Mars his bed,* III. 6. 24, *Satyrane his chaunce,* III. 9. 27, *Satyrane his steed,* IV. 4. 30, Brute *Sylvius his sonne,* III. 9. 48. This led our grammarians long ago to protest against the blunder. Charles Butler, one of the earliest of them, in his English Grammar publisht in 1634, says: "The Teutonik termination of the genitive some refined wit hath turned to *his,* perswading himself that *s* is but a corrupt abbreviation of *his,* which hee thought necessary to

restore: and therefore hee wil not write *my masters son is a child*, but *my master his son is a child*; which is just as good as if in Latin hee would say, not *heri filius*, but *herus ejus filius, est infans.*" Ben Jonson too, in his Grammar which did not come out till 1640, after his death, says: "Nouns ending in *x*, *s*, *sh*, *g*, and *ch*, in the declining take to the genitive singular *i*, and to the plural *e*; as *rose*, *bush*, *age*, *breech*; which distinctions not observed brought in first the monstrous syntax of the pronoun *his* joining with a noun betokening a possessor." Yet in spite of these protests it has been so much the fashion for Englishmen to know nothing about their own tongue, that instances of this "monstrous syntax" are to be found in many even of our best and purest writers. Milton indeed, like Jonson, seems to have kept clear of it: but in Drydens letters, where Malone has rightly followd the poets own way of spelling, it occurs repeatedly: Pope uses it: the argument of Hudibras begins with "Sir *Hudibras his* passing worth;" and shortly after, I. 1. 439, we come to

> As Cæsar's horse would kneel and stoop,
> (Some write) to take his rider up;
> So *Hudibras his* ('tis well known)
> Would often do to set him down.

Nay, Addison in the Spectator, No 135, asserts that "the single letter *s* on many occasions does the office of a whole word, and represents the *his* and *her* of our forefathers:" though, as Lowth observes, his own words carry their confutation along with them; and a little reflexion would shew that *s* could hardly have usurpt the place of *her*. In a Grammar indeed by Joseph Aickin, publisht in 1693, an attempt is made to get over this difficulty. "The causal preposition *of* (he says) is sometimes changed into an adjective possessive; as, *the King's son*, for *of the King*, where *s* is put for *his*; *Jane's daughter*, where *s* is put for *hers*; *hell's darkness*, where *s* is put for *its*." It never struck him to ask what *his* and *hers* and *its* were; or that they were originally only

the genitives of *he, her, it.* This erroneous persuasion had become so inveterate, that the republisher of Ben Jonson in 1692, taking upon him to correct his author, audaciously and silently substituted for the passage before-cited: "To the genitive cases of all nouns denoting a possessor is added *'s* with an apostrophe, thereby to avoid the gross syntax of the pronoun *his* joining with a noun; as the *Emperor's court;* not the *Emperor his court.*" Thus foisting in his own conviction that *'s* stands for *his,* and yet retaining the expression "the gross syntax," which is directly opposed to it, he has made old Ben write sheer nonsense, in a chapter which even in the old edition is far from correct. In Wallises Grammar one is startled at first by the assertion that noun substantives in English have no distinction of gender or case: which in a true English spirit he boasts of as an advantage, because it saves us a world of trouble: as if the same might not be said of ignorance; or as if anything good were to be got at without trouble. But does Wallis then entirely pass over our genitive case? He speaks of it indeed, but under another name, and calls it a possessive adjective: "which may be formed from any substantive, whether singular or plural, by adding *s,* or, if needful for the sake of the sound, *es.* Its meaning is the same as that of the preposition *of,* when it answers to the Latin genitive: as *mans nature, the nature of man, natura humana* vel *hominis; mens nature, the nature of men, natura humana* vel *hominum.*" Here in the first place it strikes one that there is nothing in the nature of our adjectives analogous to this needless variation between the two so-called possessives, *mans* and *mens.* But how is *a mans nature* to be reconciled with the character of our adjectives? and what is *a thousand mens swords?* is it *mille humani enses?* The assumption is altogether arbitrary and groundless; and taken up merely for the sake of supporting the paradox, that we have no cases. Had Wallis been acquainted with our old language, a knowledge which our grammarians and lexicographers have

strangely thought it not worth their while to acquire, he would have found that we had just as good, or as troublesome, cases as the Latin or Greek. But in comparing the disorder of our own with the regularity and symmetry of the ancient languages, one is evermore reminded how to him that hath is given, and he hath more abundance; while from him that hath not, is taken away even that he hath. That the final *s* stands for *his* however, Wallis positively denies: "for (he says) it is joind to feminine nouns, and to plurals, where *his* would be a solecism; and it is found in the possessives *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*, *hers*, where nobody can dream that *his* is containd: and indeed *his* itself, as well as *whose*, are only *hee's who's*, *his* being written for *hees*, as *bin* is for *been*." Yet to such a pitch was the confusion on this point carried, that the compiler of the index to Stows Survey of London in the edition of 1633 writes *St James's his Parke*, though Stow in the text wrote *St James Parke*. In our Liturgy too, as every one knows, we read *Christ his* sake: for though the ancient spelling of our prayerbooks has been modernized, and some slight changes made, such matters, from our recklessness about grammar, are left to the ignorant, and this gross blunder is still allowd to keep its place. Its introduction in the Prayer for all sorts and conditions of men, contrary to the analogy of the Collects for Quinquagesima, and for the fourth and twenty-fourth Sundays after Trinity, is to be accounted for from that prayer being one of the additions made on the accession of Charles II: the same blunder occurs repeatedly in the Forms of Prayer framed at the same time for Charles the Martyr, and for the Restoration. The passages in our Bible on the other hand where the same errour is pointed out by Lowth—*Asa his heart*, 1 Kings xv. 14; *Mordecai his* matters, Esther, III. 4,—have since been alterd: here again, though the corruption is found in all the old editions of the version made under James I, most of the earlier translations are without it: in Cranmers Bible of 1549 we read *Asaes harte;* in Tyndales of 1549, *Asas;*

65096

in Barkers of 1582 and 1616, *Asas* and *Mordecais:* and such is the old and right way of writing our genitives. For it was this very mistake about the origin of the final *s*, that gave rise to that useless and unmeaning practice, with which all our modern books are disfigured, of prefixing a mark of elision to it. There is no better ground for placing such an ugly mark over the genitive, than over the nominative plural: where the vowel which used to precede the *s* has been omitted in the one case, it has also been omitted in the other; and that no confusion or ambiguity of the slightest moment is obviated by the use of such a mark, anybody may satisfy himself by reading our old authors in the original editions, or in the reprints where the old orthography has been retaind. For in our old books the genitive is written without any mark of the sort: even so late as the publication of Paradise Lost, it was only introduced in a few peculiar cases. In the early editions of Milton we read "Of *Mans* First Disobedience;"—

> Yet to thir *Generals* Voyce they soon obeyd
> Innumerable, as when the potent Rod
> Of *Amrams* son in *Egypts* evill day;—

and so on. The mark of elision is only set over such words as *Siloa's* I. 11, *Gaza's* 466, *Ely's* 495, *Rhea's* 513: so, in his Minor Poems, over *Cynthia's*, *Ida's*, *Jehovah's*, *Hebe's*, *Pluto's*, "the shallow *cuccoo's* bill." Thus even in the first folio we read "Violets dim, But sweeter than the lids of *Juno's* eyes, Or *Cytherea's* breath;" though in all other cases no difference is made between the genitive and the plural. In these words, as in *do's* for *does*, the apostrophe took the place of an *e* that had been left out: for Spenser, in whom there are no such marks, wrote *Plutoes* I. 1. 37, *Unaes* I. 3. 2, *Junoes* I. 4. 17, *Sansfoyes* I. 4. 51, *Duessaes* I. 3. 27, *Archimagoes* I. 6. 2, *Cupidoes* II. 6. 35: and for the same reason we find the nominative plural written *hero's* in P. L. I. 552; *dilemma's* by Fuller, Holy State p. 66, *Penelope's* by Cartwright, Lady Errant, I. 3:

'Cause they eat their sweetmeats
In a black closet, they are counted faithfull,
The sole *Penelope's* o' th' time, the ladies
Of the chaste Web i' th' absence of their Lords.

And this accords with the practice of the Germans, who write *Grimaldi's*, *Sebastiani's*, equally for the genitive singular and the nominative plural; as they do *Shakspeare's*, *Sterne's*, *Kotzebue's*, to indicate that the *e* before the *s* belongs to the name, and is not the *e* of the genitive, which is omitted. Spenser however has *Cassiopeias* I. 3. 16, *Phædrias* II. 6. 38, *Maias* IV. 3. 42, being restraind by the preceding vowel from inserting the *e*, as well as *Phebes* IV. 5. 14, *Niobes* IV. 7. 30: and since we in our days should never dream of inserting the vowel, the note of its being left out is quite useless. Other words should be written like *its* and *whose*, which are never *it's* or *who'se*. Indeed nothing but the mistake about *his* could have led us to commemorate the omission of a letter, which in most words has not been inserted these three hundred years, and in many, such as *time's*, *nature's*, never existed. "The genitive singular (says Johnson) is always written with a mark of elision, according to an opinion long received that *s* is a contraction of *his:*" and the same account of its origin is given by Wallis: "qui autem arbitrantur illud *s* loco vocis his adjunctum esse, ideoque apostrophi notam semper vel pingendam esse vel saltem subintelligendam, omnino errant." It seems to have been in the age of Charles II that this practice first became general; when the language, which always sympathizes with, and thereby becomes symptomatical of, the moral condition of a people, was in a state of general deterioration, which Dryden was hardly able to check, and the effects of which Swift found it difficult to crush; and when our very printers, who in early times and even under Elizabeth were mostly painstaking, reacht the highest degree of slovenliness. Still more absurd is the mark of elision after the genitive plural. Milton wrote *parents tears*, P. L. I. 393: the *shearers feast* Lyc. 117: which his

editors print *parents' tears*, the *shearers' feast*. Now what in this instance has been left out? what does ' stand for? Or is it the purpose of a mark of elision to shew that nothing has been elided? It is well to have some reason for what we do, even in trifles. Wallis indeed asserts that the *s* of the plural is blended with that of the possessive, or rather that for the sake of euphony the former is elided, as the *Lord's House* for *the Lords's House*, the *Common's House* for the *Commons's House*: as if such words as *Lords's*, *Commons's*, had ever existed at any period of our language. It is only by an erroneous assimilation to the genitive singular that such plural genitives as *mens*, *womens*, *brethrens*, have been formed; for the Saxon genitive plural did not end in *s*: still the corruption never went so far as to append an *s* to a plural in *s*. The authority of Wallis however led many writers of Queen Annes time to spell the genitive plural in the same way as the singular: Gays masterpiece for instance at first was called *the Beggar's Opera*. The present fashion of placing the apostrophe after the *s* is scarcely of a hundred years standing. In the first edition of Popes Iliad, publisht in 1715, we find

> Of all the Kings, the *Gods* distinguish'd Care: I. 229:
> Rang'd the wild Desarts red with *Monsters* Gore: I. 356:
> The *Gods* Complaints, and Juno's fierce Alarms: I. 673.

Johnson too says "Plurals ending in *s* have no genitives: but we say *womens* excellencies, and Pope writes

> Weigh the *mens* wits against the *ladies* hairs."

Surely then there ought to be no scruple about getting rid of such a modern absurdity. There may not be quite so strong reasons against our manner of writing the genitives of proper names ending in *s*: but it is a very objectionable practice which produces such hideous unpronounceable words as *Venus's*, as if the very sound of her name were to betoken that she was of the seed of the serpent. Tyrwhitt in his Glossary to Chaucer, on the word *Markis*, has justly reprehended

this practice, which was then a recent innovation, and remarks that if *Venus's* is to be pronounced as a trisyllable, we ought not to cut out the *e* of the old genitive, but to write at full *Venuses*. Landor indeed and others have preferd the form *Venusis*. But though the genitive in *is* occurs in Gawin Douglas, it is a Scoticism, like his plurals, *birdis*, *ilandis*, *fieldis*, and his third person of verbs, *rollis*, *upstertis*, *apperis*. The vowel of the genitive in the Anglosaxon was *e*: so was it in Chaucers time, as appears from the very title of the *Knightes Tale*, or, to take a couple of instances, from

> That *Cristes* gospel trewely wolde preche: C. T. 483:
> That hadde a fire-red *cherubinnes* face: C. T. 626:
> And thanked him with all hir *hertes* might: 1878.

If in Wiclif we find *i* perpetually substituted for *e*, and that not only in the genitive *cristis*, in plurals,—as Gal. v. 19, "the *werkis* of the fleisch ben *witchecraftis*, *strivyngis*, *wraththis*, *chidyngis*, *sectis*, *manslaughtris*, *drunkenessis*, unmesurable *etyngis*, and *thingis* lyk to these"—but in such words as *undir*, *fadir*, *britheren*, *hymsilf*, and many more, this is probably owing to his northern extraction. In the standard English the *e* kept its ground. In Cranmers Bible the genitives *Goddes*, *Christes*, occur frequently: so do such genitives as *Asaes*; which accord with those quoted above from Spenser: and though the genitive of proper names ending in *s* is mostly the same as the nominative, Maundevile, p. 111, writes *Cayphases hows*. Spenser in like manner says of Duessa, I. 8. 48, "she growing had behind a *foxes* taile." In our pronunciation too we make no difference between the genitive singular and the nominative plural. The ordinary usage however of all our old writers agrees with that of Spenser and Milton, who write *Fair Venus sonne*, *Like Phœbus lampe*, *Morpheus train*, *Pelops line*, without any mark of elision. The apostrophe which in our days is usually placed over such genitives, is so modern an innovation that

it is never mentiond either by Wallis or Johnson in their Grammars. Our ancient practice moreover accords with that of the Germans in similar words, who, since they have given up the use of the Latin cases, regard names ending in *s* as indeclinable, and write almost uniformly *Atreus Enkel, Tantalus Sohn, Æschylos Agamemnon, Priamos Feind.*

In the past tenses of verbs on the other hand the mark of apostrophe is more frequent in some of our old poets than in modern ones. And at first there was good reason for using it. For though various methods were resorted to even in Chaucers time to get rid of the trailing termination of the preterite, whenever *ed* was written, it was pronounced as a distinct syllable. It is the same in Spenser: but pronouncing the *ed* seems already to have been something of an archaism: at all events in the greater number of verbs he uses almost uniformly a contracted form: sometimes — to take the instances that occur in the first canto — simply omitting the *e*, as in

spewd 20, *strowd* 35, *subdewd* 47,
cald 38, *expeld, compeld* 5,
seemd 1, *benimbd* 44,
playnd 47, *drownd* 36, *crownd* 48, *mournd* 4, *turnd* 54, *retournd* 42,
perceivd, 22, *resolvd* 24,
raizd, dazd 18, *gazd, amazde* 26.

In the last word, as in a variety of others, *spide* 7, *cride* 19, *satisfide* 26, *obayde* 44, an *e* is added at the end: this is a form very common in Chaucer, and Tyrwhitt accounts for it by supposing that the last two letters were transposed. Such a transposition of letters however must not be too hastily assumed: for though letters are easily made to change places, sounds, with a few exceptions, especially that of the letter *r*, have not the same propensity to shift about. In the present instance such an assumption is quite unnecessary: for the termination of the preterite in the Anglosaxon verb was *de*, answering exactly to the German *te*: hence

lovde and the like may be deduced much more naturally from the A. S. preterite *lufode* by contraction, than from *loved* by transposition. In all the writings of Chaucers age we find that from the A. S. preterite two distinct forms arose, one in which the final, another in which the penultimate vowel was omitted. Maundevile is perpetually using the full form; for instance *dyede* p. 27. 31. 87, *prechede* 35. 104, *dwellede* 37, *lokede* 30, *destroyede* 44. 49, *regnede* 45. 80, *savede* 51, *dryede* 82, *translatede* 85, *lovede* 101, *schewede* 104, *lyvede* 140. 183, *helede* 161, *reysede* 161, *askede* 166, *preyede* 180, *formede* 215. In none of these words can any transposition have taken place: why then should we imagine it in such as *answerde* p. 57. 176, *herde* 104, *seyde* 30. 32. 57, *hadde* 30. 57. 87? Indeed there is no reason to suppose that *haded* was ever in use: *havede, havde* was softend into *hadde*. So in Wiclif we find, in the 9th chapter of Matthew, *passide, glorifiede, folowide, worschipide, sueden, neighede* (drew nigh), *touchide, turnide, scorneden, thretenyde, defameden, wondride*. But to return to Spenser: in a number of verbs the final *d* by the omission of the preceding vowel was brought next to a consonant after which the conformation of our organs inclines us to soften it into *t*: in such verbs Spenser wisely endeavourd to adapt his spelling to the sound, substituting *t* for *d*

after *p*, in *grypt* 19:
after *k*, in *lookt* 16, *knockt* 29, *rockt* 55:
after *s*, in *tost* 42, *promist* 7, *nurst* 26:
after *sh*, in *vanquisht* 27, *burnisht* 40, *pusht* 42, *ravisht* 45:
after *ch*, in *stretcht* 5, *approacht* 27.

In verbs ending in *ce*, where the omission of the *e* would give the *c* before *t* the hard sound of *k*, Spenser changes it into *s*: as in *forst* 20, *enforst* 7, *advaunst, enhaunst, glaunst* 17, *chaunst* 27, *plaste* (*placed*) 47. Hence he has seldom occasion for an apostrophe, and uses it chiefly for the sake, it would seem,

of lengthening the preceding vowel: as in *ador'd, scor'd* 2, *dar'd* 37, *fram'd* 40. Miltons practice on the whole accords with Spensers; and where he abandons him, it is hardly for the better. In the first book of Paradise Lost we find, in the second edition, which had the poets own corrections, the *e* omitted

after a diphthong, in *obeyd* 337, *assayd* 619:

after *m*, in *seemd* 777:

after *n*, in *destind* 168, *ruind* 593, *joynd* 90, *regaind* 270:

after *l*, in *equald* 248, *foyld* 273, *hurld* 45, *unfurld* 535:

after *r*, in *scatterd* 304, *witherd* 612, *stird* 35, *upreard* 532, *despaird* 660:

D is changed into *t*

after *p*, in *worshipt* 397, *lopt* 459:

after *k*, in *rackt* 126, *walkt* 295:

after *s*, in *confest* 509:

after *x*, in *mixt* 58, *vext* 306:

after *sh*, in *vanquisht* 52. 476, *undiminisht* 154, *astonisht* 266, *abasht* 331, *brusht* 768:

after *ch*, in *stretcht* 209, *intrencht* 601.

In several instances too *d* becomes *t* even after a mark of elision; as in *ceas't* 283, *overarch't* 304, *condens't* 429, and in *intrans't* 301, though the consonant has been changed: in all which instances the mark is utterly needless. In *scap't* 239, *provok't* 645, it is meant to lengthen the preceding vowel, a task for which it is wholly incompetent. So is it for softening *c* before *t*, though Milton has used it for that purpose in *advanc't* 119. 536, *seduc't* 219, *experienc't* 568, *amerc't* 609; and though the apostrophe is often invested by other writers with the same inappropriate power. It may perhaps be worth while remarking that Milton in several words makes a distinction between the preterite and the participle, writing the former *seduc'd* 33, *burn'd* 228, the latter *seduc't* 219, *burnt* 562. With the exception of the few latter words, it would have been better for our language if the practice of Spenser and Milton had become prevalent. Not that they stood

alone in it: many, perhaps most of the contemporary poets write like them: Fairfax does so; so do Daniel and Chapman and Warner and Herrick and Habington and Browne. Many of these forms too lingerd till long after: for instance in the edition of Farquhar publisht in 1711 we meet with *snapt*, *whipt*, *stampt*, *pickt*, *linkt*, *stuft*, *hist:* and a number of similar preterites are to be found in the writers of his days. Such was the state of the language when authorship usually implied some degree of knowledge. But when everybody took to writing, whether he could spell or not, and the task of correcting a writers orthography and grammar fell to his printer and compositor, the natural result was that all these distinctions were done away with, and the varieties of form in our language leveld, as far as they could be, beneath a blind indiscriminate uniformity. Every preterite was made, if possible, to terminate in *ed:* so that even Lowth said, when speaking of forms like those illustrated above, that "they are harsh and disagreeable, and it were better if they were avoided and disused." Now disagreeableness is certainly a quality about which notions may differ somewhat arbitrarily: yet the word itself seems to imply, what indeed there can be no doubt about, that there is a pleasure in the perception of agreement and fitness: and surely, putting habit, which may be modified, out of the question, it is more agreeable to perceive a correspondence, an agreement, than a disagreement, between our manner of writing a word and of pronouncing it: nor is it less certain that Spensers and Miltons spelling agrees better with our pronunciation, than that which is usually receivd. Wherever such a conformity can be produced, without violating analogy, or obscuring etymology, it is assuredly desirable. As to harshness, there can be no doubt that *slipt* is much less harsh than *slipped*, pronounced as a monosyllable. Every one who has learnt the rudiments of his Greek grammar is aware that the Greeks, whose ears were of such exquisite delicacy, were scrupulous in

avoiding the concurrence of such consonants as belong to different classes, that *pt*, *kt*, *bd*, *gd* are often combined, *pd*, *kd*, *bt*, *gt* very seldom: as we see for example in ἑπτά, ἕβδομος, ὀκτώ ὄγδοος. Or a moments experiment may teach any, how much more easily the voice passes from *p* or *k* to *t*, than to *d*, and in like manner from *b* or *g* to *d*, than to *t*: for in pronouncing *p*, *k*, *t* the larynx is comprest; in pronouncing *b*, *g*, *d*, it is left in its natural state: so that in passing from *p* or *k* to *d* the conformation of the larynx must be alterd, in passing from them to *t* it remains the same. Hence these consonants are very seldom combined, except in compound words such as *lapdog*, *backdoor*, where there is a sort of pause between the two syllables; and while *apt* and *act* flow easily from the tongue, *apd* and *acd* are almost unpronounceable. The like holds with regard to the other sharps and flats: one sharp consonant combines with another sharp, much more readily than with the corresponding flat: and it is the same with the flats: *st* for instance occurs very often, *sd* hardly ever. To limit our wishes to what seems practicable: it would be well that the *e* should be omitted in all polysyllables in which it is not required either to lengthen the preceding vowel, or to soften the preceding consonant—for which latter reason it is better retaind in such words as *judgement*, *acknowledgement*—that in monosyllables it should be omitted where it does not superinduce the leaving out another letter, as it would do in *robbed*, *rubbed*; and that it should be generally changed into *t* after *p*, *k*, *f*, *s*, *x*, *sh*, and *ch*. The restricting the innovation to polysyllables is in compliance with a principle remarkt by Nares in his Orthoepy, p. 92, that the eye is more easily reconciled to the loss of a letter it has been accustomd to in a long word than in a short one: which he illustrates by our having left out the final *k* in *demoniac*, *prosaic*, *music*, *critic*, though we should be greatly offended at seeing *sic* for *sick*, *stic* for *stick*, *bac* for *back*. So we are clearly

less startled by *leveld*, and still less by *enameld*, than by *cald*: the importance of a letter in a word depending to the eye on the proportion it bears to the whole. Perhaps too, for the sake of humouring prejudice, the *e* might be kept in words like *reformed* where its omission would produce an ugly accumulation of consonants: for such is the force of habit, that *reformed* or *reform'd* has a less unpleasant look than *reformd*; though *reformd* agrees exactly with our pronunciation, and the only advantage in the other ways of writing the word is the introduction of an absurdity. The right use of the apostrophe is to denote the omission of that which is usually, or at least not unfrequently, exprest: and therefore, when the contraction first took place, and so long as usage waverd between the two forms, there was no great harm in such a mark: though even then such writers as best understood and felt the plastic powers of language, endeavourd, wherever it was possible, to avoid it. Nor would the effect of the practice here recommended be to increase the anomalies in our language: on the contrary it would diminish them. True regularity does not consist in the having but a single rule, and forcing everything to conform to it: for we shall always meet with much that will not bend to such constraint; so that, wherever this singleness is aimd at, there are always sure to be an inordinate number of exceptions. Our rules ought to mould themselves according to the nature of the objects they are to regulate: in proportion to the richness and diversity of those objects should our rules be manifold; and this very variety in the rules will oftentimes only the more powerfully display the unity of the principle that pervades them. The reason why we have such a host of irregular verbs, is our having chosen to assume that there is but one rule for all our verbs to be inflected after, and that all deviations from it are anomalies: whereas in ancient times there were several ways of inflecting verbs, all equally regular, but varying with the nature of the verb: and though in many cases we

contrived to get rid of what opposed the rule we set up, there is a very large class of verbs, in which, from their being in everyday use, the old form had become too stedfast to be changed. Thus that which once was regular is become irregular: if we wish to free the language from such irregularities, the only way is to restore them to regularity, by reviving and duly applying the principle they used to conform to. For instance such preterites as *kept*, *wept*, *crept*, *slept*, *swept*, are at present anomalies: to get rid of them would be impossible, even if anybody could wish it: but if we keep in mind the principles enforced above, and extend them to analogous cases, these exceptions become examples of a general rule founded on the very constitution of our vocal organs. And thus it is always in nature: the exceptions to one rule are the examples of another rule, and that often a higher one.

The shortening of the vowel in such words as *wept*, *slept*, is another instance of a rule very generally followd in the formation of our preterites: for example in

Chid, *hid*, *slid*, *bit*;
Left, *bereft*;
Felt, *knelt*;
Dealt, *meant*, *heard*;
Met, *bled*, *bred*, *fed*, *led*, *sped*, *read*.

In this last word though the sound is shortend, the spelling continues the same. It would be well however to write *red* for the preterite. The reason brought forward for not doing so, to avoid its being confounded with *red*, the colour, is of no moment. The establishing arbitrary distinctions between words which have no etymological connexion, has never been an active principle in language; nor is such an argument ever resorted to, except when there is nothing else to be said. At all events it tells the other way: it is much easier for cases to arise where it is ambiguous whether *read* is the present or preterite, than whether *red* is the verb or the adjctive. A like reason would lead us to write *spred* for the preterite and participle.

In another class of those verbs which our grammarians have unluckily termed irregular, much confusion has been occasiond by an inability to perceive distinctions, and an unreasonable love of uniformity. The difference which in most verbs existed between the Anglosaxon preterite and participle, having in the majority of cases been obliterated by rubbing off their terminations, it was held to be a general principle that they should be the same: and though in many of the irregular verbs the two distinct forms have been preserved, very little judgement has been shewn in the use of them. Everybody indeed would now reject, as vulgarisms, such expressions as *he had went, it was gave, it was wrote.* Campbell indeed, Phil. of Rhet. II. 2, finds great fault with Lowth for objecting to *I had wrote,* as a barbarism, and maintains that no expression sanctiond by usage can possibly be barbarous. Now though it is true that the decision in all questions about language must ultimately rest with usage, usage here, as in other things, has always a spice at least of ignorance mixt up with it; and even when we allow it to be infallible, we are aware that, like other infallibilenesses, it is very liable to go wrong. The business then of grammarians, and of scholars generally, is to keep usage in the right way; to point out the principles by which it ought to be guided; and to warn it against the delusions that are misleading it. They may be forced to bow to the majority in the end: but they have a right and duty to enter their protest beforehand: and they should never be too ready to despair of doing away with a nuisance. Lowth, though he does not seem to have known that it was the pervading principle of our old language to make a complete distinction between the preterite and participle, and that the general identification of the two forms was originally owing to nothing more than a corruption, fosterd perhaps by the notion that, *I loved* and *I have loved* being so nearly synonymous, the preterite *loved* and the participle *loved* must be the selfsame word, still, from a liking for what

have been well termed organical forms, which a familiarity with the ancient languages cannot fail to cherish, felt desirous of preserving them wherever they had not been utterly effaced. For this wish he is also reprehended in the Diversions of Purley, II. c. 7, with the authors wonted severity: Horne Tooke had taken it into his head that the "past participle is merely the past tense adjective;" and so, falling in with a writer who differd from him, instead of searching into the grounds of his opponents opinion, he took the easier course of displaying his own ignorance, by charging Lowth with not knowing what he was talking about. Now there is a class of verbs, which at one time was much larger, wherein the *i* of the present became *a* in the preterite, *u* in the participle; such as

Swim	*swam*	*swum*
Spin	*span*	*spun*
Begin	*began*	*begun*
Ring	*rang*	*rung*
Sing	*sang*	*sung*
Sink	*sank*	*sunk*
Drink	*drank*	*drunk*
Shrink	*shrank*	*shrunk.*

That this principle was a general one is clear, not only from the regularity with which it prevails in German, but from our meeting with several forms in our scanty remains of Anglosaxon, which attest it, but which became obsolete very early. Thus

Bindan (to bind) formed	*band*	*bunden*
Geswingan	*geswang*	*geswungen*
Findan	*fand*	
Windan	*wand*	
Grindan	*grand*	
Slitan	*slat.*	

In very early times however the participle began to be used instead of the preterite: we find it thus not seldom

even in Chaucer and Gower; and there is so great a mass of authority in favour of such a practice, that it is much too late at this day to object to it. But the converse should be carefully avoided; though if the form in *a* is made use of, the odds are that it is as a participle. He *had drank too much*, I *have rang the bell*, *have you swam across*, is indeed every bit as incorrect as *I have wrote a letter:* but people are far from being aware that it is so. Farquhar for instance, Love in a Bottle, III. 1, writes: "I would have *drank* and fought for any one of 'em:" Vanbrugh, Relapse, III. 3, "That is for fear you should be *drank* before you are ripe." The old and right distinction between the two forms on the other hand is exemplified in Chaucers character of the Pardonere, C. T. 712:

> Wel coude he rede a lesson or a storie,
> But alderbest he *sang* an offertorie:
> For wel he wiste, whan that song was *songe*,
> He must prechen, and wel afile his tonge,
> To winne silver, as he right wel coude:
> Therfore he *sang* the merier and loude.

The same distinction is well preserved in a line of Herricks:

> As lately I a garland bound,
> 'Mongst roses I there Cupid found:
> I took him, put him in a cup,
> And *drunk* with wine I *drank* him up.

In our version of the Scriptures, though *sung* and *sunk* are used both actively and passively, *sang* and *sank* are always active: so are *drank* and *began*, while *drunk* and *begun* are never used except as participles: and in most questions of language it is impossible to find a better model by which to regulate our practice.

As we have lost the distinction between the preterite and past participle, so have we that between the present participle and the verbal substantive. This point is well discust by Taylor, the editor of the Diversions of Purley, Vol. I. pp. xvii—xxxiii, whose notes

are so learned and sensible as to make us regret that there are not more of them to counteract the errours of the text. The termination of the present participle in Anglosaxon was *ande* or *ende*, answering exactly to the German participle, and akin to the Latin in *ans* or *ens*. *Ing* on the other hand, or *yng*, was the termination of the verbal substantive, corresponding to the German *ung*: the traces of it still remain in a number of our nouns, such as *dwelling*, *building*, *wedding*, which are not, as they are commonly said to be, derivatives from the participle, but were nouns before the participles they are supposed to come from existed as such. Indeed had it been otherwise it would have been exceedingly difficult to account for the formation of such verbals from the active participle: their natural derivation is from the passive participle, as in Latin, or from the passive verb, as in Greek. In Chaucers time we still find instances of the old participle: for instance in his Dreame,

> And al so fully her *servand*
> As crëature or man *livand*: 1630:
> And in her hand
> The herbe she toke, well *avisand*
> The lefe, the sede, the stalke, the floure: 1885.

So in the Romaunt of the Rose,

> The god of Love delivirly
> Came *lepande* to me hastily: 1928:
> Pointis and sleves be wel *sittande*
> Ful right and streight upon the hande: 2264:
> The rich men are ylovid aie,
> And namely tho that *sparande* bene: 5366.

The same form occurs in Peirs Plouhman; for instance near the beginning,

> In praiers and in penaunces putten hem manie
> Al for the love of oure Lorde, *lyvend* ful harde
> In hope to have a gode ende.

So does it in Gower:

> Wherof the nymphes of the welles,
> And other that there weren els
> Unto the wodes *belongende*,
> The bodie, which was deade *lyggende*,
> For pure pitee that they have
> Under grave thei begrave: Fol. XX
> Of that she sawe hir deathe *comende*,
> And than unto the ground *knelende*
> Tofore hir father she is falle: Fol. LXXI.
> Forthy she gan hir eie impresse
> Upon his face and his stature,
> And thought how never creature
> Was so *welfarende* as was hee: Fol. CII.
> So that in many wise he sought
> His wit *wakende* er it was daie: Fol. CII.

Indeed in Gower the form is common enough, though rare in Peirs Plouhman and Chaucer; so rare in truth that in the first fourteen thousand lines of the Canterbury Tales there is not a single instance of it. In most cases it had already been supplanted by the modern form derived from the verbal substantive. This substitution is conjectured by Taylor with great ingenuity and plausibleness to have arisen out of the frequent use of the verbal substantive with the prefix *a*, for *on*, in a sense very like that of the participle: in such phrases for instance as *they are gone a-hunting*, *a-fishing*, and the like. Besides here again some influence may probably be ascribed to the confusion of elements in our language. A struggle between two persons will often end in the destruction of both by a third, who comes in and crushes them when they are exhausted. It is observable that in all the instances quoted above the participial termination *end* or *and* is attacht to Teutonic verbs; with the exception of *servand*, a word which had already been adopted in the Anglosaxon. With our Norman words that termination does not seem to have coalesced readily: in this as in so many cases similarity of form seems only to have strengthend repugnance. The Norman verbs retaind their own

participle in *ant* or *ent:* in Chaucer we find *joinant, pas-sant, suffisant:* and it has left numerous traces behind it in our verbals, *abundant, attendant, important, conver-sant, pleasant, triumphant, defendant, claimant, assail-ant, indulgent, dependent, student,* and the like. The verbal substantive in *ing* on the other hand was common to all our verbs, and thus got the better of the two participles that were contending for the superiority.

A mistake is also commonly imagind to have given rise to a construction directly repugnant to a practice of our language, which is so uniform that it may well be called a rule, in the common phrases, *I had rather do, you had better go.* Leave out the adverb, and no one would take *I had do, you had go,* to be English; and the go-between can hardly be said to legalize the union. Campbell (Phil. of Rhet. B. II. c. 2), Lan-dor, and others suppose that this corruption originated from the misunderstanding of an old contraction *I'd rather, you'd better;* where *'d,* which often stood for *had,* was put instead of *would.* Plausible however as this explanation is, a little search in our ancient writers proves it to be unfounded. The phrase is of frequent occurrence in our old dramatists: for instance it is printed at length in Hotspurs speech, H. F. I. III. 1:

> *I had rather be* a Kitten, and cry mew,
> Than one of these same Meeter Ballad-mongers:
> *I had rather heare* a Brazen Candlestick turn'd.

Thus again in the famous dialogue in Julius Cæsar:

> *I had rather be* a Dogge, and bay the Moone,
> Then such a Roman:—
> By Heaven, *I had rather coine* my Heart,
> And drop my blood for Drachmaes.

So in Webster, Duchess of Malfy, III. 5, "*I had rather have* his heart than his money:" in Massinger, City Madam, IV. 3, "*you had best tell* so." And these expressions are confirmed by other analogous ones: such as in the Duchess of Malfy, II. 4,

> *We had need go* borrow that fantastick glass
> Invented by Galileo the Florentine
> To view another spacious world 'i th' moon,
> And look to find a constant woman there:

in the same play, v. 2,

> Be well advis'd, and think what danger 'tis
> To receive a princes secrets: they that do,
> *Had need have* their breasts hoop'd with adamant.

That this latter expression is elliptical, *to* being omitted, as it often is in our old writers where modern usage inserts it, appears a couple of pages further in the same scene. "In such slippery ice-pavements *men had need To be* frost-nail'd well, they may break their necks else." In the same play, I. 1, we find: "It is fitting a soldier *arise* to be a prince, but not necessary a prince *descend* to be a captain: he *were far better do* it by a deputy:" where the second quarto reads "*he were far better to do it.*" It makes the same insertion in another speech in the same scene: "I am making my will, and, I pray, sir, tell me, *Were not one better make it* smiling." Thus in Haughtons Englishmen for my Money, I. 1, we find within a few lines, "*You're best tell me* I lye," and "A man *were better to live* a lords life and do nothing:" in which expression accordingly *a man were better to live* is a more concise way of saying *it were better for a man to live.* If we go back to the early part of the 16th century, we find Lord Berners using the phrase *I had rather* in his translation of Froissart, I. 10, where Sir John of Heynaulte says to his brother: "*I hadde rather renounce and forsake* all that I have, and *go serve* god over the see, and never to retourne into this countrey, rather than this good lady (queen Isabella) shulde have departed from us withowte comforte and helpe." Half a century earlier in the Morte D'Arthur we find, "But to yelde me unto the as recreaunt *I had lever deye* than to be soo shamed:" I. 23: "I *had lever* than the stynte of my land a yere that he were on live:" I. 24: "*Ye were better to gyve* me a yefte:"

I. 17. So in the old poem of Adam Bel, Clym of the Cloughe, and Willyam of Cloudesle:

> *Lever I had,* sayde Wyllyam,
> With my sworde in the route *to renne,*
> Then here among myne ennemyes wode
> Thus cruelly to bren: 140:
> But *I had lever have* geven you
> Good market townes thre: 518.

Maundevile, p. 34, says of the lords in Cyprus, that "at grete festes and for straungeres thei setten formes and tables, as men don in this contree: but *thei had lever sytten* in the erthe." In Chaucer too we find the same expression under a variety of forms:

> For *him was lever han* at his beddes hed
> Twenty bokes clothed in blake or red,
> Than robes riche, or fidel, or sautrie: C. T. 296:
> But *me were lever* than all this toun, quod he,
> Of this despit *awroken for to be:* 3750:
> Yet *had I lever wed* no wife to yere: 5750:
> All *had hire lever han borne* a knave childe: 8320:
> Yet *were me lever* houndes had me eten: 9312:
> *I hadde lever dien* on a knif,
> Than thee offenden, dere trewe wif: 10037:
> Yet *had I lever spenden* all the good
> Which that I have (and elles were I wood)
> Than that ye shuld fallen in swiche meschefe: 16844:
> N'ot I nat why, *me were lever to slepe,*
> Than the best gallon wine that is in Chepe: 16972.

These passages are only a sample of those which might be adduced: they suffice however to shew that the phrases illustrated do not owe their origin to a mistake, but became idiomatical in an age when the use of *to* before the infinitive was far less determinate than at present: as may be seen in the following lines from the Canterbury Tales.

> Thou art so wise, *it nedeth thee nought teche:* 3599.
> Me *neded not do* lenger diligence: 5787.
> What *nedeth you rehersen* hir array? 10612.
> *Him behoves serve himself* that has na swain: 4025.

Wel *ought I* of swiche murmur *taken hede:* 8511.
This sely carpenter *beginneth quake:* 3614.
And on his lippe *he gan* for anger *bite:* 3743.
Againe this knight this olde wif *gan arise:* 6582.
And *wend han hit* this Alein atte full: 4303.
But ik am olde: *me leste not play* for age: 3865.
And everich hath of God a propre gift,
Som this, som that, as that him *liketh shift:* 5686.
Swiche charge he gave, as him *list on hem lay:* 8069.

The last three passages are more especially to the point: still, according to the principles of our language as now establisht, the expression *I had rather do* involves so gross an anomaly, that it would be better to get rid of it. In many cases *would* might advantageously be substituted for *had:* where this cannot be done, some other phrase might be selected.

There is another construction however, nearly akin to the former, which, as no more satisfactory explanation can be given of it, seems to have originated in a mistake. Our ancestors used to exclaim *Would God!* that is to say, *O that God would!* which was just the reverse of *God forbid!* Thus in the Canterbury Tales,

Now *wolde God* ye mighten wel endure! 9632:
Now *wolde God* that it were waxen night! 9636:
But *wolde God* that all thise rockes blake
Were sonken into helle for his sake! 11204:
Here at your feet *God wold* that I were grave! 12288.

"*Wolde God* (exclaims Maundevile in his Prologue), that the temporel lordes and alle worldly lordes weren at gode accord, and with the comen peple wolden taken this holy viage over the see! thanne I trowe wel that within a lytel time oure righte heritage, the Holy Land, scholde be reconsyled and put in the hondes of the righte heires of Jesu Crist." This phrase is now usually transformed into *would to God!* which Campbell (II. 2), supposes to have been a mistranslation of the French *plût a Dieu!* The corruption was probably promoted by the similar phrase *I hope to God,* which is of such antiquity as to occur in Chaucer, C. T. 9548. This was

supposed to justify the use of the preposition *to*; and *would* was taken to be the first person.

In no class of words are corruptions resulting from mistaken analogies commoner than in adjectives: some of these affect only the meaning of the word; others extend to its form. A termination of frequent occurrence is often attacht to words with which it will not rightly coalesce: or else it is invested with a sense which does not properly belong to it. For in consequence of our language being such a medley of totally distinct and not very well assorted elements, we are more deficient than most other cultivated nations in that nice tact for propriety of speech, which is only to be traind by perpetual exercise, and by which an offense against the laws of language is instantly detected and condemned. A curious example of such corruptions is the transformation of *rightwise* into *righteous* spoken of above, p. 6: and a long list of similar ones may be found in the last chapter of the Diversions of Purley. To go through all their various forms would furnish matter for a separate dissertation of no inconsiderable length: it will be enough in this place to bring forward a single class of adjectives as a sample; nor can any be better fitted for the purpose than those in *ble:* with regard to which Horne Tooke in the chapter just referd to has some remarks not destitute of ingenuity, but characterized by more than his usual inaccuracy and precipitancy in catching at whatever seemd to support the favorite hypothesis of the moment, without being at the pains to examine whether it really made for him or not. The main part of our adjectives in *ble* come, as everybody knows, from Latin verbals in *bilis;* and, like their originals, they have mostly a passive signification. This rule Horne Tooke chooses to make absolute, and says that very few instances of verbals in *bilis* used actively are to be found in good authors, but that there are abundance in Plautus. Poor Plautus is against him, and so is of no weight:

had his authority been the other way,- how Horne Tooke would have urged his great antiquity and consequent importance! Proceeding then to account for the multitude of similar exceptions in English, he asserts that the Italians adopted the German termination *voll*, our *full*, and softening it into *vole* stuck it on to a number of their adjectives, such as *abominevole*, *amichevole*, *capevole*: "which the French by a most slovenly pronunciation, not distinguishing between *bile* and *vole*, transformed into *abominable*, *amicable*, *capable*, and so on." Now that the Italian *vole* comes from the German *voll*, may possibly be true; but it requires evidence; and Horne Tooke has not produced a tittle, though he ought to have been aware how delusive in etymology is mere similarity of sound. From the look of the words he enumerates one should rather come to a different conclusion: for *voll* or *full* is properly and generally appended to a substantive, and implies an abundance of any quality, as *beautiful*, *sorrowful*, *careful*: but how are *capevole*, *conducevole*, *durevole*, *inchinevole*, to be resolved? *B* and *v* are so often interchanged, that, till evidence to the contrary be brought forward, it is safer to regard these words as dialectic corruptions of the older forms, which in most of the instances have continued in use along with them. Still more questionable is Horne Tookes second assertion. Of the twenty-four French adjectives in *ble*, which he says are derived from Italian adjectives in *vole*, much the greater part certainly are not so, if indeed a single one of them is. *Abominabilis* and *amicabilis* for instance are used by the later Latin writers; *capabilis* by Augustin and others, to signify that which can be taken or comprehended; *conducibilis* by Plautus and others; *concordabilis* by Censorinus; *culpabilis* by Apuleius, Arnobius, Tertullian; *delectabilis* by Tacitus, Apuleius, Aulus Gellius; *durabilis* by Ovid, Columella, Apuleius; *favorabilis*, actively or passively, by Pliny, Quintilian, Seneca, Florus; *honorabilis* by Cicero and Livy; *inclinabilis* by Seneca; *rationabilis* by Seneca and Quintilian;

as one may see by merely looking into Forcellini. In Italian too *abominabile* was in use: so was *amicabile*, and *conducibile*, and *colpabile*, and *dilettabile*, and *durabile*, and *favorabile*, and *inchinabile*, and *onorabile*, and *profittabile*, and *risibile*, and *sembiabile*. Yet the French were so wantonly perverse, that they overlookt all these words from which their adjectives come naturally and analogously, to go and hunt out a set of words from which they could only deduce them by means of "a most slovenly pronunciation." Nay, *miserable* and *memorable* are brought in to swell the list, and must needs come, not from such common words as *miserabilis* and *memorabilis*, but from *miserevole* and *memorevole*: though in these words, as in several of the others, the passive signification of the verbal is preserved. But Horne Tookes practice, when he was at a loss for arguments, was to send out into the highways and hedges, and compell them to come in. His name however stands so high among our writers on etymological subjects, as a man of learning and research in contradistinction to the metaphysical theorists, that it is worth while to notice another instance of the unscrupulousness with which he hazards his assertions, and which amounts to something very like dishonesty. For the sake of making out his point, that the adjectives in *ble* were imported into our language in the time of Edward III, he asserts that Gower "took very little advantage of this then newly introduced abbreviation. He uses only six of these words: *credible*, *excusable*, *impossible*, *incurable*, *invisible*, *noble;* and one made by himself, I believe, in imitation, *chaceable*." The last remark seems to be brought in, as minute details are into a false story, to trick one into believing that there is good ground for what is asserted; or at least that some degree of pains have been taken to verify it. And yet one can hardly cast ones eye over Gowers lines for a couple of minutes without meeting with some other adjective that ought to have been included in this list. How many such he actually makes use of, it

would require a good deal of trouble to determine: but half an hour spent in turning over his pages has supplied the following examples:

> Of that the reignes be *mevable*,
> The man him selfe hath be *culpable:* Fol. IV:

a truth of which we have just seen so memorable an example.

> That no man maie togeder serve
> God and the worlde, but if he swerve
> Frowarde that one, and stonde *unstable:* VI.
> For man of soule *reasonable*
> Is to an angel *resemblable:* VI.
> And right so in *semblable* cas: XI.
> And thus the temple purified
> Thei have of thilke *horrible* sinne: XIII.
> As I beknowe me *culpable*,
> Ye that be wise and *resonable*,
> My fader telleth your advise: XXVIII.
> It is not *discordable*
> Unto my worde, but *accordable:* XCIX.
> By this ensample a kynge maie see,
> Hymselfe, and eke his counceil bothe,
> Howe they ben to mankynde lothe,
> And to the god *abhominable:*
> Ensamples that ben *concordable*
> I fynde of other princes mo: CLXI.
> His name is good and *honorable:*
> Thus was the stewarde *favourable:* CLXV.
> The sacrifice is wasted so,
> Whiche might not ben *acceptable*
> Upon suche sinne *abhominable:* CLXIX.
> For where honour is *remevable*
> It oughte wel to ben advised: CLXX.

Of these words several occur frequently; and the list, however imperfect, is quite enough to shew what degree of credit is due to Horne Tookes assertions. But to return to the adjectives in his list for which we cannot discover Latin originals, it is much more probable that they were formed by English or French writers—for in England at least these words were imported by the learned—after the analogy of those previously introduced, than

that they have anything to do with the Italian adjectives in *vole*. *Colorable* for instance is clearly formed, as its meaning shews, from the English verb *to colour*, and not from *colorevole*, which indeed, though Tooke places it in his list, does not appear to have ever existed: at least its not being found in Alberti or the Crusca is more than enough to counterbalance the authority of so careless an inquirer. And why should *agreable* come from *aggradevole*, and not from *agreer?* or *pleasurable* from *piacevole*, not from *to pleasure?* or *vengeable* from *vendichevole*, not from *to venge?* Though these words have an active meaning, there are so many others to bear them out in this, that it is presumptuous to object to them on this account: and in no manner of way can this serve as a proof that our blunder, if it be such, is the repetition of an Italian one. Nay our own adjective *able*, which Horne Tooke conjectures, without however bringing forward any grounds for doing so, to be the original of the Latin *bilis*, was at all events enough to invest these adjectives with an active signification: nothing was more natural than the resolution of *available* into *able to avail*, of *profitable* into *able to profit*, and so on. The same cause has made us readier to attach the termination *able* to our Saxon words, such as *answerable*, *bearable*, *unspeakable*, *unutterable;* and though in many cases the two elements in our language are averse to this kind of intermixture, in this instance, owing perhaps to the word *able*, it has answered perfectly. The frequency of this termination however has misled us into attaching it to a number of words with which it is far from assorting equally well. A true feeling of analogy would have withheld us from employing it in the formation of any but verbal adjectives, and those too such that the meaning of the adjective should correspond with that of the simple verb. *Conversable* for example, if it means *able to converse*, is formed analogously; if *fit to be conversed with*, unanalogically. Hence the word *reliability*, coind by Coleridge in his

eulogium on Southey, is scarcely admissible: for we do not say *to rely a person*, but *to rely upon him*. Still more faulty are words in which the verbal character is entirely lost, and in which the termination *able* is appended to substantives. *Customable* has rightly given way to *customary: peaceable*, as Tooke observes, is a needless substitute for *peaceful: personable, companionable, sizeable, conscionable, unconscionable*, are words which, though good authority may be produced for them, are not without reason called monsters by Horne Tooke; and all who care about purity of speech would do well scrupulously to avoid them.

In the terminations of our adverbs and prepositions again no little confusion has been occasiond by our having forgotten the origin of particular forms and the sense they were designd to convey. The genitive, which in German often becomes an adverb, as in *flugs, gutes Muthes, morgens, abends, nachts, rechts, links*, was similarly used in Anglosaxon. *Sothes* for instance, *of a sooth*, is the common rendering for ἀμήν; being the genitive of *sothe*, truth, (whence *forsooth*), which is used by Chaucer, C. T. 1523. 1627. 3922. 6513. 13970; as is the adjective *soth*, 3391. 4355. 15682, and the adverb *sothly*, 117. 470. 1104. 1186. 1938. 2723. Of the same kind is the adverb *nedes*, frequently used by Chaucer (C. T. 1171. 1292. 2326. 3030. 6653. 7620. 7887. 8407), and still retaind in the contracted form *needs*, which Horne Tooke (1. 10) resolves into *need is*, but of which his editor gives the right explanation. *Once, twice, thrice*, are also adverbial genitives, and were originally written *ones* (C. T. 767. 1036. 1838. 2390. 3280. 3470. 12967), *twies* (C. T. 4345. 13478), *thries* (C. T. 63. 465. 564. 578. 2956. 2957. 13472); like the German *erstens, zweitens, drittens*. The analogy of these words probably led us to adopt the French *certes*, which is so common in our old writers—C. T. 877. 924. 929. 1147. 1239. 1267: and it also led both in England and Germany to the use of *s* as an adverbial termination in a number of words where it can hardly be explaind to be

the sign of the genitive. Such is the case in the German adverbs *vorwärts, rückwärts, wenigstens, meistens, höchstens, vergebens, zusehends, eilends:* and in several English ones with regard to which usage is very unsettled, and requires to be fixt.

Beside and *besides* are used almost indiscriminately, sometimes as an adverb, sometimes as a preposition; and those who have tried to draw a distinction between the two forms have made it turn altogether upon the sense, using *beside* for *by the side of*, *besides* for *over and above*, whether as a preposition or adverb. But as this is altogether arbitrary, and there is scarcely anything to sanction the final *s* appended to a preposition, it would be advisable to adopt a distinction better grounded on principle, and to write the adverb with, the preposition without the *s*. In Chaucer the common form is *beside*, C. T. 447. 876. 969. 1480. 1680. 6002. 8167. 11553: *besides* however is also found, v. 404.

Of our adverbs compounded with *ward* those which are in commonest usage have mostly an *s* at the end, though etymologically it has nothing to do with them: for it is the mark of the adverbial genitive, which they are not. Yet the same misapplied analogy has attacht it inseparably to the high German *vorwärts, rückwärts*, and the like: here too the old form was in *wart*, and the low German still ends in *wert*. In Chaucers age *ward* was often put after names of places:

Ful many a draught of win he hadde draw
From Burdeux ward, while that the chapmen slepe: C. T. 398.
Eche of you to shorten with youre way
In this viage shall tellen tales tway,
To Canterbury ward, I mene it so,
And *homeward* he shall tellen other two: 796.
His banner he displaide, and forth he rode
To Thebes ward, and all his host *beside*: 969.
And in the night than wold he take his way
To Thebes ward: 1485.

And breke an hole on high upon the gable
Unto the gardin ward over the stable: 3572.
Whan he is gon
To Scotland ward his fomen for to seke: 5138.
This senatour repaireth with victorie
To Rome ward, sayling ful really: 5388.
The morwe came, and forth this marchant rideth
To Flanders ward; his prentis wel him gideth: 13230.
To scoleward and homeward whan he wente,
On Cristes moder set was his entente: 13480.

These passages exemplify the nature of the word, and shew that the final *s* does not properly belong to it. *Homeward* occurs again C. T. 1219. 2958; *againward* 4861; *onward* 972; *afterward* 1575; *thiderward* 2532; *upward* and *downward* 2758; *toward* 27. 5243. 5285. 5568. 7610. The other form however was coming into use:

For sikerly my dette shal be quit
Towardes you, how so that ever I fare: 11883.

Lord Berners and Holinshed wrote *afterward;* and as no manner of purpose is served by the final sibilant, it would be well to follow their example. With regard to *toward* even Miltons usage is indeterminate: he writes *towards* P. L. III. 89. 350. 581, *toward* III. 435. 739; without any apparent distinction of meaning. Euphony would lead us to prefer the latter form; for every *s* we can get rid of is so much gain. If there is any reason for allowing *forwards* and *backwards* to stand, it is to distinguish the adverbs from the adjectives.

In several prepositions and adverbs the corruption has been carried further; and after beginning with subjoining the adverbial *s* we have stuck on a *t* to the end of it: the origin of which is not very clear: for the analogy of the adverbs derived from participles, *agast, atwist, adrift,* is hardly strong enough to have given rise to it. Yet the preposition *against* is now never written without it; though the old form of it is *again,* as we see perpetually in Chaucer, C. T. 66.

1511. 1789. 2453. 2682. 4184. 4811. 5419. 6257. 6582. 7070. 8046. 8787. 10456.

> How may this weke woman han the strength
> Hire to defend *again* this renegate? 5353.
> Sheweth your poure servant Claudius,
> How that a knight called Virginius,
> *Agein* the lawe, *agein* all equitee,
> Holdeth, expresse *agein* the will of me,
> My servant, which that is my thral by right: 12116.

Occasionally too it was written with a final *s*: as C. T. 3041. 8196. 12677.

> That fro his lust yet *were him lever abide*,
> Than do so high a cherlish wretchednesse
> *Ageins* fraunchise and alle gentillesse: 11828.

The *t* seems not to have been added till later.

It is the same with *amongst*. Chaucer writes *among*, C. T. 2941. 5066. 7832. 13432; and *amonges*, 2974. 4603. 5070. 5248. 8861. 9902. 12954:

> And spake of mirthe *amonges* other thinges: 761:
> Ovide *amonges* other thinges smale: 6534.

Horne Tooke indeed seems to regard *amongest* as the oldest form, and as a derivative from a participle: but the predominance and apparently superior antiquity of the other forms would rather dispose us to look upon *a* as the preposition prefixt to one of the numerous forms of the verbal substantive *menge*.

Such at all events is the origin of *amid*, used in the C. T. 3808. 9944, and with the adverbial termination, 2011:

> *Amiddes* of the temple sate mischance
> With discomfort and sorry countenance.

So Spenser F. Q. I. 1. 36:

> He to his studie goes: and there *amiddes*
> His magick bookes and artes of sundry kindes
> He seeks out mighty charmes to trouble sleepy minds.

Both these forms are etymologically defensible: not so *amidst*, which has got the better of the former and

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018